A. G.

The Library
INTERNATIONAL CHRISTIAN
GRADUATE UNIVERSITY

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_T4-AHV-936

The Library
INTERNATIONAL CHRISTIAN
GRADUATE UNIVERSITY

The Library
INTERNATIONAL CHRISTIAN
GRADUATE UNIVERSITY

THE AGE OF THE FATHERS

VOL. I.

The Library
INTERNATIONAL CHRISTIAN
GRADUATE UNIVERSITY

WORKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR

LESSONS FROM THE LIVES OF THREE GREAT FATHERS: St. Athanasius, St. Chrysostom, and St. Augustine. With Appendices. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

SOME ASPECTS OF PRIMITIVE CHURCH LIFE. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

THE ROMAN SEE IN THE EARLY CHURCH: and other Studies in Church History. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

THE INCARNATION AS A MOTIVE POWER. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

MORALITY IN DOCTRINE. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

HYMNS AND OTHER VERSES. Fcp. 8vo. 5*s.*

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
LONDON, NEW YORK, AND BOMBAY

THE AGE OF THE FATHERS

BEING

CHAPTERS IN THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH DURING THE FOURTH AND FIFTH CENTURIES

BY THE LATE

WILLIAM BRIGHT, D.D.

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD AND CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH

IN TWO VOLUMES

VOL. I.

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON

NEW YORK AND BOMBAY

1903

All rights reserved

The Library
INTERNATIONAL CHRISTIAN
GRADUATE UNIVERSITY

PREFACE

THE ground covered in these volumes is almost exactly the same as that traversed by Dr. Bright in his earliest work, *The History of the Church from A.D.* 313 *to A.D.* 451. But the treatment is very different: that book was written for students, and it was the work of an annalist aiming at completeness and verifying each statement by reference to the authority for it: this is intended to be more popular; the interest of the reader is not distracted by notes, the less important details are omitted, and attention is concentrated on the lives of the great fathers and on the great doctrinal controversies; it is the work of an historian and a theologian, writing with a more perfect mastery of his materials, with a truer sense of their relative importance, and with a greater freedom and richness of style.

But, though more popular, it is also more learned. It is enriched by a wide and varied reading of thirty-five additional years; and those who have been privileged to see Dr. Bright's note-books—his "Sylva" as he called them, amounting to more than sixty volumes—will know with what thoroughness and with what freshness of interest he was wont to digest his reading and make it available for future use. It is also illuminated by the experience of later travel in the countries of which he writes, and many of the scenes described—in Milan, in Rome, and elsewhere—gain a new force from the mind of one who has looked upon them, and looked upon them with the eyes of a vivid imagination, able to bridge the gulf between the scene as it was and as it now is. Above all, the form of the book is affected by the fact that it reproduces the lectures with which he charmed and stimulated and inspired generations of Oxford students. They, at least, as they read the book, and, to a certain extent, all readers with them, will not picture to themselves an historian writing in his study, but

35872

will see and hear a lecturer: they will see the merry smile breaking over his face if any event has its ludicrous aspect, the fire lighting up the eyes at the mention of the courage of witnesses for the truth; they will hear a voice ringing through the room as it recalled the bold denunciations of passion or of cowardice even in a Christian Emperor, or hushed into a solemn quiet at the mention of the Sacred Name: they will recall a personality lifted by constant friendship with the great personalities of St. Athanasius, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, St. Chrysostom; and seeing with his eyes, they will therefore see with the eyes of the actors themselves the events which he portrays.

It must be acknowledged that Dr. Bright was not well acquainted with German, and it is possible that some modern contributions to our knowledge even of the original materials for the history of the period may have escaped him. On the other hand, few, if any, scholars of our generation have moved with such ease among the primary Latin and Greek contemporaneous writers and among the eighteenth-century literature of the subject, and it may well be that an intimate familiarity with the editions of the Benedictines of St. Maur, with Mansi's *Concilia*, and with Tillemont's *Mémoires*, is still the best equipment for an author who would communicate to his readers a real and intelligent understanding of "The Age of the Fathers."

In the treatment of the narrative there will be found all those marked characteristics which we have long been accustomed to associate with Dr. Bright's work, an enthusiasm for great characters, a picturesque and almost poetic power of painting the chief episodes, and above all that delicate sureness of touch in handling questions of doctrine, that fear of exaggeration, that sense of balance, which springs only from a loyal reverence for truth, developed through years of mature reflection. It is in keeping with this that we who have had occasion to examine Dr. Bright's manuscript and to note the successive changes made in it, have come to realize how there grew up in his mind a greater tenderness and charitableness of judgment towards those who opposed the orthodox view, and a greater effort to credit them with those aspects of truth for which they were, however onesidedly and wrongly, yet honestly contending. At the same time, his indignation against the unfairness of some recent Roman controversialists has perhaps led him to adopt an unduly suspicious and hostile attitude towards the occupants of the Roman see.

Dr. Bright's lectures—on which the present work is based—were carefully written out (although in delivering them he never adhered strictly to the text) in a series of ten note-books, of which the first is dated in 1870 and the eighth in 1873; the ninth and tenth bear no date, but internal evidence shows that the ninth was not completed before 1880 at the earliest. In all of them the narrative occupies the right-hand page, while the left-hand page is devoted to references and to quotations from original documents. In all of them new matter was from time to time incorporated in the narrative or added on the opposite page: but in the earlier there are abundant traces of a further and systematic revision, which was apparently undertaken in direct preparation for the printing of these volumes; and the discrepancy between the proofs as we received them and even the later note-books shows that a somewhat similar though less drastic revision must have been continued on the type-written sheets. The last note-book ends with the close of Chapter XLVII.: and for the two concluding chapters we have had at our disposal no other material than the printed slips. It is possible that the account of the Council of Chalcedon was only put on paper for the purpose of the present book.

Before Dr. Bright's death the whole work had been type-written; and pp. 1-320 of the first volume had received his final corrections and had been printed off. When therefore Dr. Bright asked me on his death-bed to be responsible for the publication, it seemed an easy task; but when we came to read over the pages already printed, we were compelled to recognize, as the list of errata will prove, that it had been with a rather failing eye and hand that Dr. Bright had worked at the end. Consequently it has been necessary—and this must be our excuse for the delay in publication—to examine the rest of the work carefully; to check statements by reference to the original manuscript and (occasionally) to the authorities on which they were based; to remove certain inconsistencies which had been caused by additions made at the last moment; at times to re-arrange the order of the material. The greater part of this task has been undertaken by Mr. C. H. Turner of Magdalen College, Assistant Lecturer to Dr. Bright during the years 1888–1901, whom I cannot adequately thank for the care with which he has executed it; but we have also been greatly helped by the Rev. R. G. Fookes, of Lea Rectory, Gainsborough, who has undertaken the laborious

task of preparing the Index out of affectionate devotion to his friend and teacher.

In one of his later poems, Dr. Bright gave touching expression to the dread which all must fear of the limitations of old age—

> "of the inward change
> On mind and will and feelings wrought;
> The narrowing of affection's range,
> The stiffness that impedes the thought:
> The lapse of joy from less to less,
> The daily deepening loneliness."

But to his despondent mood the answer seemed to come from the Psalmist's words, "They also shall bring forth more fruit in their age;"

> "A voice responds: It need not be:
> Refuse to grow at all points old;
> Keep fresh the stream of sympathy,
> On no pure interest loose thy hold;
> His own true self he ne'er survives
> Who strikes a root in other lives."

These words have found a fulfilment already in the painstaking and unselfish efforts which others have made to render this book worthy of him and of its subject; and they will find a fuller response yet in many who will read it and catch some of the writer's enthusiasm for the Church and its Truth.

WALTER LOCK.

Keble College,
August 16, 1902.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	The Toleration of Christianity	1
II.	Donatism and the Council of Arles	12
III.	The Councils of Ancyra and Neocæsarea	34
IV.	Licinius and Constantine	41
V.	The Beginnings of Arianism	53
VI.	The Nicene Council.—Part I.	71
VII.	The Nicene Council.—Part II.	99
VIII.	The Short Internal Peace	111
IX.	The First Troubles of St. Athanasius	136
X.	From Treves to Sardica	156
XI.	The Church after the Sardican Council	191
XII.	The Second Arian Persecution	215
XIII.	The Variations of Arianism	246
XIV.	Ariminum and Seleucia	264
XV.	Results of the Council of Ariminum	283
XVI.	Julian	294
XVII.	Internal Church Affairs under Julian	323
XVIII.	After the Pagan Reaction	337
XIX.	The Episcopate of St. Basil	367
XX.	Gratian and Theodosius	394
XXI.	The Catholic Revival at Constantinople	408
XXII.	The "Second General Council"	425
XXIII.	The West in the Last Years of Damasus	462
XXIV.	St. Ambrose and Justina	483
XXV.	St. Ambrose and Theodosius	503
XXVI.	The Last Years of Theodosius	520

ERRATA

Page 27, line 7, *for* "urbis," *read* "orbis."
,, 28, line 1, *add inverted commas after* "Londinensi.
,, 28, line 17, *for* "Adelphius," *read* "Adelfius," *as in* line 2.
,, 54, line 11, *for* "pursuit," *read* "dispute."
,, 68, line 38, *for* "Alexandria and Arius," *read* "Alexander and Arius."
,, 77, line 1, *for* "much altered," *read* "must attend."
,, 78, line 26, *for* "Heracles," *read* "Heraclea."
,, 80, line 20, *for* "retain it for," *read* "retain for it."
,, 81, line 26, *for* "we," *read* "he."
,, 82, line 9, *for* "discipline," *read* "discussion."
,, 105, line 29, *for* "subicariæ," *read* "urbicariæ."
,, 119, line 3, *for* "*For*," *read* "For."
,, 124, line 31, *for* "Tiberius," *read* "Tiberias."
,, 127, line 11, *for* "began," *read* "begun."
,, 129, line 30, *for* "finish," *read* "furnish."
,, 130, line 1, *for* "1457," *read* "1453."
,, 136, line 26, *for* "althongh," *read* "although."
,, 152, line 11, *for* "were ready," *read* "was ready."
,, 170, line 9, *for* "of anti-Alexandrian prejudice," *read* "or anti-Alexandrian prejudice."
,, 174, line 5, *for* "safeguards the (1)," *read* "(1) safeguards the."
,, 174, line 22, *omit* "new."
,, 184, line 8, *for* "Gaudentius of Narcissus," *read* "Gaudentius of Naissus."
,, 184, line 26, *dele comma after* "before."
,, 184, line 29, *for* "formerly," *read* "formally."
,, 195, line 40, *for* "Constantine," *read* "Constantius."
,, 201, lines 16, 17, *for* "two priests of Alexandria, and a layman without," *read* "two priests of Alexandria and a layman, without."
,, 203, line 21, *for* "Constantine," *read* "Constantius."
,, 205, lines 2, 3, *for* "the second Sunday of the second week," *read* "the Sunday of the second week."
,, 207, lines 9, 10, *for* "illustrating, as we may say with such tragical vividness," *read* "illustrating, as we may say, with such tragical vividness."
,, 212, line 17, *for* "omissiom," *read* "omission."
,, 216, lines 38, 39, *for* "Constantine," *read* "Constantius."
,, 228, line 36, *for* "thought it their duty," *read* "thought it his duty."
,, 242, line 33, *for* "Oxyrinchos," *read* "Oxyrhynchus."
,, 249, lines 10–12, *read* "This was the 'Homœan' theory, called 'Acacian' from Acacius, bishop of Cæsarea, its chief representative."
,, 252, line 20, *for* "as," *read* "so."
,, 260, line 15, *for* "Homoousion," *read* "the Homoousion."
,, 274, line 3, *for* "contumacions," *read* "contumacious."
,, 277, line 39, *for* "fruitful to," *read* "fruitful in."
,, 280, line 16, *for* "the library of the Louvre," *read* "the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris."
,, 280, line 22, *for* "this," *read* "thus."
,, 291, line 15, *for* "these orthodox," *read* "those orthodox."
,, 301, line 33, *for* "grotesqne," *read* "grotesque."
,, 306, line 6, *for* "campaign," *read* "campaigns."
,, 311, line 21, *for* "Dorotorum," *read* "Dorostorum."
,, 318, lines 39, 40, *for* "on one hand," *read* "on the one hand."

THE AGE OF THE FATHERS

CHAPTER I.

THE TOLERATION OF CHRISTIANITY.

THE close of the last great Heathen persecution is naturally called the close of the primitive period of Church history. It is not without a deep moral significance that the supreme effort of the pagan world-power to trample out the life of the Kingdom that is not of this world should bear the name of Diocletian, rather than of its true originator Galerius. The able and far-sighted founder of a new Imperial system, affecting as he did on all occasions, in Gibbon's phrase, "the calm dignity" of a "Jove-like" ruler, in whom was represented the ascendency of reason over impulse, was long reluctant to inaugurate a new persecution against a large body of his subjects, whose religion had for more than forty years been formally recognised as *licita*, that is, as permissible under Roman law, and whose traditional "pertinacity" had been proved in its previous collisions with the government. At last, indeed, he yielded to the urgency of Galerius, the savage-minded ex-herdsman whose domineering temper had begun to overawe him, and whose pagan superstition was an incentive to the worst barbarity against Christians; and having taken his resolve, he showed himself bent on suppressing the Church's worship not only by destroying buildings and annulling rights, but by crowding the prisons with all its ministers, and endeavouring by torture to make them apostatize. But he did not retain the Imperial power for more than two years and some two months

from the 23rd of February, 303, the day on which the work was begun by destroying the great church at Nicomedia; and Galerius—who kept up the persecution until a horrible and prolonged disease had broken his spirit in the end of April, 311—and his nephew, the ferocious Daza, called Maximin, the "worst of all" the persecutors, as he is described by Eusebius, and whose character was a blend of odious qualities, were beyond comparison more active than Diocletian in the attempt to stamp out Christianity. But still he, with whom rested the ultimate shaping of the Imperial policy, did give—with whatever unwillingness—the first impulse to that desperate undertaking; and history is so far not unjust when she casts over his memory the whole gloom of a tragedy of which the largest and most hideous portion was enacted by men far worse than himself, when he had long retired to his Dalmatian privacy. It was "under Pontius Pilate," who had repeatedly "sought to release Him," that Christ "suffered;" and the final warfare of the Wild Beast against His servants was "Diocletian's persecution" after all.

The event which finally put an end to it, and actually brought in a new era, was the victory of Constantine over Maxentius, "the tyrant rather than the sovereign" of Rome, at the "Red Rocks," nine miles north-west of Rome, on October 28, in 312: it is usually, indeed, associated with the Milvian bridge, the "Ponte Molle," where Maxentius was drowned as he attempted, in his flight, to cross the Tiber and gain the city. It was a battle, says the historian of "Italy and her Invaders," which "ensured the triumph of Christianity throughout the whole Roman world:" a victory which the Senate, three years later, commemorated by the erection of the Arch of Constantine near the Colosseum, and attributed, in studiously vague terms, to "an impulse from the Divinity." And when senate and people thronged to welcome the Augustus of Gaul, Spain, and Britain (whose reign had practically begun at York in 306), to thank him as a deliverer, and to hail him as a monarch, the Roman Christians, from Pope Melchiades, as Eusebius calls him, or rather Miltiades, downwards, had reason enough to share in the general joy. They, indeed, and their brethren through the West, had for some time been substantially free from persecution: in this memorable October of 312, more than seven years had elapsed since the compulsory abdication of their old enemy Maximian; and even when he, for a time, resumed the purple as the associate of his son Maxentius, he does

not seem to have interfered with that policy of conciliation which Maxentius found it prudent to observe towards the Church, in the interests of his unsettled throne. But no permanent reliance could be placed on the humanity of a prince enslaved to the vilest licentiousness, and to that foul craft of the magicians which, in the preceding century, had greatly contributed to produce the persecution under Valerian. The Christians of Rome, therefore, could not regret Maxentius, and could not but look with hope and good will on the true heir of that kind-hearted Constantius, who had at least drawn near to the true religion, and even while he was subordinate as a "Cæsar," had done as little as he could against its professors, although he had been obliged to publish the first two edicts. This hope and good will would be increased by the growing rumour that Constantine, on his march southward, had been warned by a mysterious vision,—or, as perhaps one form of the story was even then circulated in Rome, by a marvellous appearance in the sky, visible to his soldiers as well as himself,—to advance in confidence of victory under the "ensign" of the Cross. And when the Christians saw a statue of the conqueror rising up in the midst of the city, with a cross-like staff in its hand, and an inscription referring to "this saving sign," they may be supposed to have given full play to their most sanguine expectations of brilliant triumph as the fruit of so eminent a conversion. Yet Constantine was not yet, in any true sense, converted. He had been greatly impressed by the tragical fate of several conspicuous enemies of Christianity: he had given up the "secularism" which, as he frankly told a Western Council two years later, had once led him to think that "no supreme power could see into the secret of his bosom," had learned to assimilate his father's faith in One God, and had prayed for help to that God whom his father had worshipped: *something* had happened to impress him profoundly with a conviction that safety and prosperity would be found in identifying that God with the object of the Christian faith and devotion; and so he was led to recognise in the Christ of the Church, not indeed as yet a Saviour and Cleanser of the soul, but, at any rate, an invincible Patron and Protector. He was still far off from the faith which works by love, from the sense of sin that craves for moral renewal; he had but reached the position of believing that "power belonged to" the Christians' "God," and it may be doubted whether for several years after this date he had formed

any convictions which could commit him to a real adoption of Christianity.

In fact, it was but by degrees that his policy advanced even as far as to an absolute religious toleration. Some time in 312—probably before the overthrow of Maxentius—he had put forth an edict which conceded to Christians freedom of worship, but under certain restrictions which afterwards seemed to him less than just. He was at present on good terms with Licinius, who five years before had been invested by his old comrade Galerius with the full imperial dignity: the provinces of Illyricum were his principal domain, and from thence he passed over into Italy, in order to cement his alliance with the conqueror of the West by espousing his sister Constantia. There is not a little confusion of accounts and theories as to the order of events which followed; but on the whole we may suppose that it was in the early part of 313 that the two princes met at Milan, and there promulgated the famous edict which ensured liberty of worship—in its terse energetic Latin, *liberam atque absolutam colendæ religionis suæ facultatem*, to Christians *and* to all others alike, on the ground that this was accordant with right reason—expressly cancelled the restrictions of the former edict, and intimated a hope that this grant would be rewarded with the favour of "the Supreme Divinity." Maximin, the "half-barbarian" *protégé* of Galerius, who had raised him to Cæsarship, and ultimately had conceded to him the dignity of Augustus, was now sharing the Eastern part of the empire with Licinius. He had a bitter animosity against Christianity, stimulated by a clique which, like Julian in after-days, aimed at establishing a mystic Platonized Paganism. And accordingly he had in divers ways harassed the Asiatic churchmen. But now he felt that policy required an alteration of his programme; and in a letter to Sabinus, his prætorian prefect, in which, to save his own dignity, he ignored the Western edict, he pretended that he had always desired to use persuasion rather than coercion in order to reclaim Christians to the worship of the gods; that he had indeed yielded to memorials addressed to him from certain cities, praying that Christians might be forbidden to live within their precincts, but that his motive was a regard to precedents, and a belief that the gods approved their desire; however, he *now* deemed it fitting to renew his commands that the Christian provincials should be "left free to follow their own religion." They, for their parts, knew better than to rely on

Maximin; he had more than once rekindled the fury of persecution: after the wretched Galerius had put forth *his* Edict of Toleration, permitting Christians to profess their faith, and desiring them to "pray to their own God for his welfare," Maximin verbally ordered a relaxation of the persecution, but within six months took indirect methods for renewing it, procuring addresses to be made to him against the Christians, to which in his mandate to Sabinus he alludes, and replying to them with rhetorical commendations and full assent. The tyrant, it was observed, on the present occasion, had not sanctioned any public exercise of Christian rites; and his Christian subjects received further proof of his real intentions, when he suddenly "threw off the mask" of a good understanding with the other emperors, and marched into the territory of Licinius. Then it was that, as the Christians believed, he vowed to Jupiter, that if victorious in the impending conflict, he would "utterly extinguish and annihilate the Christian name," while Licinius on his side offered up prayer to "the Holy and Highest God," and caused the words to be put on record, and repeated by his troops. On April 30, 313, the armies met; Maximin was defeated; he flung away his purple, put on a servile dress, and fled one hundred and sixty miles in twenty-four hours. When safe in Cappadocia, he resumed his imperial garb, and vented his fury on many Heathen soothsayers who had promised him victory; he then put forth one final edict, proclaiming an unequivocal and absolute toleration. In this document he expresses regret that his benignant intentions in the preceding rescript have not been fully apprehended, so that some of his subjects have needlessly "hesitated to resume the religious rites which they prefer." Wherefore he gives all men full notice that any person may freely embrace or follow Christianity; that churches ("the Lord's houses") may be built; and further, that any houses or lands, of right belonging heretofore to Christians, and confiscated, seized, sold, or granted away, shall be restored to Christian ownership. One scene more remained in the life of this unhappy tyrant, who might have rued the day when he was taken, as a young peasant, "from the flocks and the woods," to become soldier, bodyguard, tribune, Cæsar, and Augustus. He took poison in despair, by one account, but it wrought slowly, and produced a long death-anguish; and when his bodily eyesight was gone, he seemed to "see God, as surrounded by ministers in white, and pronouncing his doom." Then, according

to this awful narrative in the "De Mortibus Persecutorum," he shrieked out "as men do under torture," and cried, "It was not I that did it, but the others!" and afterwards expired in great misery, imploring compassion from Christ. Stories of this kind by no means inspire implicit confidence; and perhaps, as in the case of the death-cry invented for Julian, this tale of the agonized death-bed of Maximin represents what Christians wished to believe as to a manifestation of divine justice: at the same time, it is not incredible that such a revolution of feeling should have been produced by intense suffering, and should have elicited, at the eleventh hour, something like a recognition of the Christians' God.

The death of the last persecutor took place in August, 313, about six months after Diocletian, "broken with sorrow, shame, insult, sickness, and old age"—he was seventy-eight—had died in his immense palace at Salona. Licinius, having in the midsummer of this year secured his position in the East as against Maximin, promulgated the Edict of Toleration in his own name and in Constantine's, on his arrival at Nicomedia, the capital of the East, which under Diocletian's care had rapidly grown into magnificence, and, as we have seen, had possessed a stately church conspicuous on a hill. The Church, then, throughout the Roman world participated in the religious freedom permitted to all sects: she had no special privilege accorded to her, nothing like ascendency, nothing like "establishment;" the followers of every strange and weird cult were to be completely on a par with her members in the eye of the law. But the edict took pains to make it clear that the confiscation of Christian property was annulled: whatever had formerly belonged to individual Christians, or to their corporate body as such, and had been alienated during the late troubles, should be restored; and, to make this restitution complete, the officials should take care that no price should be demanded for such property: the non-Christian holders should surrender it absolutely, and look for compensation from the Imperial munificence.

We now see the nature of the great Act of Toleration, which is connected with the name of the great city of North Italy. Milan had witnessed, some eight years earlier, a scene full of hope for the then afflicted Christians of the West, in the first abdication of Maximian, who, as its non-Christian inhabitants would gratefully recollect, had richly adorned it with stately buildings. It was

afterwards to see some events of importance—one at least of tragical importance—in the contest of the ancient faith with a great heresy; and it was to derive an imperishable glory from the episcopates of one of the greatest of Christian men, and, in a far distant age, of an eminently self-devoted pastor. But now the illustrious city which from the beginning of the century had been virtually the capital of the West was honoured indeed by becoming the scene of that memorable Imperial conference, which gave the Church rest from a series of inflictions involving trials of peculiar intensity. Technically, as we have seen, the edict of the two emperors did not go much farther than that of Gallienus, which had made Christianity a *religio licita:* it did not commit the emperors to a single distinctively Christian sentiment, but spoke generally of "the Divinity reigning on high;" and it explicitly guarded against the appearance of "disparaging any mode of worship." Yet, while it confined itself to the simple object of securing universal freedom in matters of religious observance, the half-century which had elapsed since the edict of Gallienus had seen so wide a diffusion of Christianity, and the persecution of the last ten years had so thoroughly demonstrated the impossibility of uprooting it, that the emperors were but recognising the patent fact of its moral triumph, when they proclaimed toleration to be necessary for the public peace. The Roman empire was *not* converted to the faith; but the faith had drawn into its obedience such masses of whatever throughout the empire was noblest and manliest, that the absolute toleration of the Church as no longer an "illicit" combination, but a recognised lawful society, and its gradual advance to the position of a State religion, were inevitable necessities of government. "The State," says J. J. Blunt, "did not give its countenance to Christianity until it could no longer withhold it:" and even if Constantine had not personally (to say the least) learned by this time to hold the Name of Christ in awe, he might still have framed the Edict of Milan, and have thus prepared the way for a subsequent official adoption of the faith. Paganism was stricken to death before it lost its legal supremacy; and when placed on a footing of legal equality with the religion which its gravest writers had once taken for an "exitiabilis superstitio," the ultimate result could not be doubtful. And as the worst cruelties have again and again been the result of a panic, we may discern in the barbarous policy of Galerius and Maximin a perception of "the beginning of the end." They

struck at the Christian system furiously—one might say frantically—for they felt that even now their blows might come too late.

The Imperial orders touching the buildings which had belonged to the Church, or to individual Christians, prove that before the persecution there were many churches, as we should now say, in existence and use; and thus they illustrate Eusebius's statements as to the erection of new and spacious churches in all the cities, towards the beginning of the fourth century, and the destruction of churches which signalised the beginning of the Diocletian persecution. These "houses of prayer" had belonged to the Christian society as "licita;" and there were also lands recognised as the property of that body, a recognition now solemnly confirmed by the edict, in terms which "secured the revenue as well as the peace of the Church." In this same spring of 313, Constantine wrote to Anulinus, the proconsul of "Africa," enforcing the necessity of restoring to "the *Catholic* Church of the Christians" all the property—"gardens, houses, or anything else"—which had of late years been taken from them. Instructions were given to Ursus, the minister of finance in the African province, to pay to Cæcilian, bishop of Carthage, a sum described as 3000 "folles," and reckoned by Gibbon as £18,000; and the bishop received a gracious letter from Constantine, desiring him to distribute it among "the ministers of the legitimate and most holy Catholic worship," according to a "brief" or list, which would be furnished to him by Hosius, bishop of Cordova. More would be supplied, if necessary, by the Imperial steward of estates, Heraclides. Another letter, written shortly after to the proconsul Anulinus, sets forth the Emperor's conviction that the Christian religion, when legally observed and practised, has brought great prosperity to the empire; and proceeds to decree that "those who are called Clerics in the Catholic Church, over which Cæcilian presides," shall be wholly exempt from the obligation to serve any public office, that so they may be free to "devote themselves to the observance of their own" religious "law."

If the Western Christians had their own special satisfaction in having found such a patron as Constantine, the Easterns would feel a peculiar relief in being delivered from such a tormentor as Maximin. They would look with exultation on his statues, now lying shattered on the ground; their children would be taught to laugh at the black paint which was rubbed over his portraits. Even the cruelties perpetrated by Licinius upon his wife and

children, who were relentlessly put to death, would probably, in the circumstances, excite no other emotion than what might be expressed by "Laissez passer la justice de Dieu!" And the news that judgment had been done on the agents of his malignity towards the faithful would be hailed with stern exultation. It had found them out, then, after all, that infallible, inevitable avenging Hand: Culcianus, who had shed the blood of the saints in Egypt, and Theotecnus, who at Antioch had stimulated a renewal of persecution by means of pretended oracles from a new-made image of Zeus Philios,—they had been overtaken by the wrath of God, had come under those "millstones which grind tardily, but grind to powder." The Lord, it was felt, had interposed to "extirpate the wild beasts that ravaged His flock;" those men of pride "who set themselves against Him were laid low;" "their image was annihilated in the city;" they were but "lately like the towering cedars, but now their place could nowhere be found." "A splendid cloudless day" had followed on a long darkness; the Church had "a new song put into her mouth;" "she saw the desert blossoming as a lily;" she felt that the mercies now bestowed were "beyond her expectation;" her joy was expressed by festal gatherings for the dedication of new and statelier sanctuaries, with solemn beauty of ritual and full-voiced choral praise, and Christians of "every age" pouring out their souls in thankfulness, and communicating in "the mystic symbols of the Saviour's Passion." On such occasions, the bishops and other ecclesiastics delivered addresses; and Eusebius preserves a florid specimen of his own oratory, pronounced at the dedication of the new Cathedral, so to call it, at Tyre. He proceeds to give some description of the church: his notions of fine writing were not very compatible with distinctness, but we can discern the outer enclosure or precinct, the entrance into the cloistered quadrangle, the gates opening into the vestibule (afterwards called the *narthex*), the nave with its lofty roof of cedar, and the screened chancel with the altar in the midst, and seats for the clergy in a semicircle beyond. "On the outside of the nave," but opening into it, were rooms and offices for various purposes of the Church. If the Eusebian description shows how instinctively, and as a matter of course, the Church of this period invested her public worship with forms of visible majesty, and built up her sanctuaries "like high palaces," "exceeding magnifical," it also helps us to the conclusion that a community which could rear so august a temple in the very

city where, some three years earlier, its members had been made to "fight with beasts," could not "stand in much need of secular help, nor owe its success to the help that it was about to receive."

At such dedication-services, Eusebius tells us, brethren from different countries were wont to meet. We can imagine the variety of thrilling and inspiring reminiscences, which each would be able to contribute as they narrated their experiences of the persecution. The Christians of Palestine, for instance, would tell of those martyrs to whose "good confession" Eusebius has devoted thirteen chapters between his 8th and 9th books: of Procopius who headed the catalogue, of Apphianus who had boldly stopped the governor's hand when sacrificing, of Agapius who had played the man in Maximin's presence, of the maidens Theodosia and Ennathas, of Paul who had spent his last breath in a series of detailed intercessions, of the learned and generous Pamphilus and his companions, including the white-haired deacon who knew the Scriptures by heart, and the young servant-boy who called on Jesus amid the flames. From Antioch would come praises of the heroic deacon Romanus, and of others who were "roasted on grates of fire;" from Nicomedia, where the storm first broke out, there would be tales of the chamberlains of Diocletian's palace, Dorotheus and his fellow-martyrs, and of Lucian the learned Antiochene presbyter, who was carried to Maximin's capital city of Nicomedia, defended Christianity in his presence, and died of tortures in prison. Again, an Egyptian Christian would dwell on the protracted sufferings of his brethren in the Thebaid, when thirty, or sixty, or a hundred men, with wives and little ones, were butchered in a day, and the very swords were blunted and broken with ceaseless use; he would speak of Philoromus, who had once been seen every day administering civil justice, with soldiers round his tribunal, but who sacrificed everything for the name of Christ; he would, perhaps, quote the words of Bishop Phileas to his flock at Thmuis on the example of Him who humbled Himself even to death, and on the martyrs as inspired by that supreme example; he would tell how Phileas practised what he taught, resisting the tears of wife and children, confessing the Crucified as his God, and invoking with his last breath "the Immaculate and the Incomprehensible One;" and he would depict the great hermit Antony as almost courting martyrdom, standing in his white woollen cloak before the prefect, and encouraging the faithful, in that autumn of 311 when Peter of Alexandria was suddenly seized and beheaded.

A Western Christian would not be silent, although Western Churches had had but two years of suffering; he would glory in the marvellous endurance of Vincent the deacon of Saragossa, in the youthful self-devotion of Agnes and Pancratius, in Vitalis the slave at Bologna, in Afra the penitent at Augsburg; perhaps he would have heard how, in far-off Britain, Alban had died for sheltering a priest, and professing his faith after discovery.

Such would be some of the recollections then fresh and glowing in Christian minds, of those soldiers of Christ who had "willingly offered themselves" to fight His battle and to "overcome by His blood." For a time, the Church in the East had little else to do than thus joyously to reorganize her system, rebuild her churches, and commemorate her martyrs; it was for her, so to speak, a long bright Paschal festival. But we must shortly turn to the internal troubles which already in this year 313 had begun to disturb one part of the Western Church, and read the first pages of the painful history of Donatism.

Yet one lingers instinctively as if unwilling to pass onwards out of the calm sunshine which, like some benignant presence, was at this time gladdening almost every province of the earthly kingdom of our Lord. It was the golden prime of the fourth century, when His servants—to adopt the Vulgate rendering of a well-known prophecy—might seem to be "sitting amid the beauty of peace, and in tabernacles of confidence, and in rich repose." Many of them might think, as the young Athanasius evidently thought, when he gave vent to his buoyant expectations in the beautiful book on "The Incarnation of the Word," that the Church was almost foretasting the final victory; that the "Royal banners" would now advance without serious hindrance, rapidly winning the world to its true Master. They would not, in their exultation, in their fervid enthusiasm of hopefulness, take home the thought that very intense religious happiness is often granted as a strength against trials to come. And when such troubles did come, in partial rekindling of persecution, or in the "long tragedy" of the Arian conflict, or in manifold experience of the resisting force of Heathendom, or in the disappointing discovery of the incurable viciousness of Roman social life, some loyal souls, worn and wounded even to faintness, would look back fondly to the happy year of the Great Edict, as Apostles, fulfilling the ministry of the Cross, "desired to see one of the days of the Son of man."

CHAPTER II.

DONATISM AND THE COUNCIL OF ARLES.

One of the leading features of the Great Persecution was the effort made by the government to seize and destroy the copies of Scripture. "During the long period of repose," says Bishop Westcott, "which Christians enjoyed after the edict of Gallienus, the character and claims of their sacred writings became more generally known, and offered a definite mark to their adversaries." The first of Diocletian's four edicts—a decree which appeared very early in 303, when the old Emperor had not yet been induced even to imprison the clergy—commanded that the Christian churches should be pulled down, and the Christian sacred books should be burned. This was first carried out on February 23 at Nicomedia. Lactantius condenses the scene into three words, "Scripturæ repertæ incenduntur;" and Eusebius "with his own eyes" saw similar sacrileges perpetrated at a later time, although it appears from his narrative that copies of Scripture had escaped this destruction, and were still in use at Gaza when persecution raged there in 307. The "Acts" of Agape and her companions, accepted by Ruinart, speak of the martyrs as refusing to give up the books and parchments of Scripture, some of which were seized in a private house. Felix, bishop of a town in Africa, is bidden to give up such books, "all of them that he has." He answers laconically, "*Habeo, sed non do.*" At his next hearing the proconsul asks why he will not give up "scripturas supervacuas," perhaps implying that any books which he chose to hand in, whether sacred books or not, would be considered as satisfying the legal obligation. Felix makes the same reply: the question and answer are once more repeated: the bishop is taken to Italy, and the prefect asks, "Felix, why do you not give up 'Scripturas Dominicas'? or perhaps, you have not got any?" The intention

of the magistrate—as had so often been the case in persecutions—was evidently to give the prisoner a loophole of escape; but Felix again answers, "*Habeo sed non do,*" and receives sentence of death. Among his dying words is the significant sentence, "Evangelia servavi." Again, in the "Acts" of Saturninus, Dativus, and other African martyrs, we read of a bishop named Fundanus, who consented to give up the books of Scripture; and of a brave sufferer named Emeritus, who, stretched on the "Little Horse" and horribly tortured, was asked, "Have you any 'Scriptures' in your house?" and replied, "I have—but in my heart," probably meaning, "it is impossible for me to part with them;" of another, Ampelius, who made a similar answer; of another, a youth, who to the same question answered simply, "I am a Christian;" then, when his flesh was being lacerated with iron hooks, added, "I have the Lord's Scriptures, but in my heart—I pray Thee, O Christ, grant me patience!" At Cirta, the old capital of Numidia, the "curator" or administrator of town-property called on Paul, the bishop, to give up "the Scriptures of his law" (or religion): the bishop evasively answered, "The Lectors (readers of Scripture in church) have them, but we will give up what we have here." Bookcases were found in the church, but empty: a subdeacon (who seems to have ranked below a reader) produced, on further demand, "one very large manuscript;" the officials went to a reader's house, and obtained four other manuscripts; at other houses, five manuscripts, or two, or six, were surrendered: at length, a "public servant" was sent into a house to search for "Scriptures," and reported that he could find none. Similar scenes were enacted at Zama and Furni. So it was that in Africa, while the persecution lasted in that province, many Christians obeyed the summons to surrender the sacred books—then, we must by the way observe, well known as such, as forming a recognised New Testament Canon. Those who thus yielded must have told themselves, and told others who censured them, that they had neither by word or act disowned their belief in the truths of Scripture; that this belief, in its real life and force, was not dependent on the possession or the perusal of so many "codices" or "membranæ;" that their compliance—a reluctant compliance—with the Imperial order, now the law of the Roman world, was not an apostasy, but would rather tend to avert harder trials that would make apostasies only too frequent. "We are not *Lapsi,*" they would urge; "we are not even guilty of any ecclesiastical offence." The answer would

be brief and indignant: "You can be disloyal to our Lord without formally denying Him. He trusted you with His own book, with the very records of His redemptive life, and you betray the precious deposit to be torn in pieces and burnt by the blasphemers —by those who would fain tread underfoot His religion. You are not Lapsi—granted; but you are *Traditores!*"

The name thus given, associated as it was with treason, hit the mark, and became a byword. Towards the end of Diocletian's reign, and of the first reign, so to speak, of Maximian, on the 5th of March, 305, a synod of bishops had met amid the fortified heights of Cirta, for the consecration of a new prelate to that see. They met in a private house, the churches not being yet restored. Secundus, of Tigisium, presided, and opened the proceedings by saying, "Let us first examine ourselves: you"—turning to one bishop called Donatus—"are said 'tradidisse.'" The bishop thus accosted made an evasive reply, indirectly asking indulgence, "Reserve me to God's judgment," but remarking that he had escaped the summons to burn incense. "What, then," rejoined Secundus, "are we to say of the martyrs? They won their crowns because they made no betrayal." "Leave me to God," was the answer: "to Him I will give account." "Come this way," said the president; and then addressing a bishop named Maximus, repeated, "They say too that *you* are a Traditor." Maximus answered that he had given up some papers, but no books (codices). Another prelate said that he had given up "some medical books," practising a subterfuge which the officials often tolerated, or even suggested. Another affirmed that the "curator" charged with carrying out the edict had forced him to throw the four Gospels into the fire: "and after all, I knew that the writing had become nearly illegible! but," he added, "pardon me this offence." Secundus then addressed Purpurius of Limata: "It is said that you have killed your two nephews." The savage African temper broke forth in Purpurius: "Do you think you can frighten me? I have killed, and will kill, all who oppose me: but *you*—how did you get off, when called upon to give up the Scriptures? Do not provoke me to say more." This home-thrust produced an unexpected change in the curious drama: Secundus had been for some time in the hands of soldiers, and it was presumed that he had not been freed without some compliance; his nephew warned him to close the inquiry, if he did not wish to provoke a schism, which would leave him isolated and regarded as a heretic; and the

president, finding three other bishops of the same mind—or, as they euphemistically phrased it, disposed to leave the suspected prelates to God—acted on the advice by saying to them, "Take your seats;" whereupon the synod exclaimed, "Thanks to God!" The relief, perhaps, was felt by all the bishops present; and so, this unwelcome subject being dropped by common agreement, they consecrated Silvanus to the see of Cirta. It was proved in 320 by an official inquiry before the consular Zenophilus that this man had been one of the subdeacons under the late bishop Paul, when in May, 303, volume after volume, including "a very large codex," had been surrendered by readers or subdeacons to the magistrate; and on that occasion he had taken part in surrendering two gold and six silver chalices, six silver urns, seven brass candlesticks, and seven silver lamps, with men's and women's tunics and shoes; and had himself brought out a silver lamp, and a silver vessel from a secret place in the church behind a jar. In this sense he might be called a Traditor; and the Christians of Cirta exclaimed, "Give us another man, one of our own city; Silvanus is a Traditor,—hear us, O God!" The new bishop was actually placed in his seat by the strong arms of Mutus, a gladiator employed in the "arena;" while the faithful generally worshipped apart in the "Cemetery of Martyrs," and in the "Casa Major." This was the enthronement of Silvanus, in the Easter week of 305.

By way of contrast to the Traditors, we must now observe that the intemperate zeal which glowed in so many African Christians, as if the heat of their climate had imparted, in De Broglie's phrase, "un aspect *farouche*" to their very Christianity, had already given trouble to Church authorities. There were cases in which men anticipated the summons to "give up their Scriptures" by coming forward of their own accord to say, "We *have* books, and we will *not* give them up." Some who took this line were persons of no good character, or were debtors to the Imperial treasury, and might be supposed to aim at whitewashing their reputation, or enjoying the bountiful supplies which usually passed through the prison-gates to brave Confessors. But, whatever might be the motive, all voluntary self-perilling was a form of that precipitate rushing into trial which Montanistic fanaticism might call heroic, but which to the sound judgment and reverential humility of Catholics seemed nothing better than tempting the Lord. Cases might arise in which a sudden and decisive prompting from above might warrant a Christian in thus attracting, instead of awaiting, "the blast of

the terrible ones: " but, ordinarily, so to act was sheer presumption; and thus the Church's mind had expressed itself quite early in the history of persecution, as when the Smyrnæan Church, in the Epistle on the Martyrdom of Polycarp, gravely pronounced its disapproval of those who surrendered themselves, referring to the unhappy case of Quintus the Phrygian, who, after having done so, gave way to panic, and apostatized; so Cyprian had said that Christians ought to " confess," not to " profess,"—" not to surrender themselves of their own accord to the Gentiles;" and so Peter of Alexandria in 306 censured those who thus " drew on themselves " a storm of temptation. " The sober sense of the Church," says Lightfoot, " was again and again needed to rebuke and discourage the spirit of challenging martyrdom;" and thus it was on a well-understood principle that Mensurius, bishop of Carthage, forbade his flock to pay any respect to persons who had volunteered a refusal to surrender the sacred books. He himself, he admitted, had eluded the search for those books by putting in their place, at the " Basilica Novarum," some " worthless writings of heretics," which the officers unsuspectingly carried off. It was presently suggested to the proconsul that the bishop had tricked him in this business; but he declined to act on the suggestion. However, Mensurius made himself some enemies, within the Church, by his severity in the one case and his stratagem in the other: he was blamed for want of sympathy with Christian self-devotion, and suspected of having committed the complex offence of acting as a Traditor and falsely pretending that he had only seemed to do so. In St. Augustine's words, " it was said that he had lied in saying that those books were not Scriptures, and had been minded thus to hide his sin; although he was also blamed for the deceit itself." A party formed itself against him, headed by Donatus, bishop of Casæ Nigræ in Numidia; it was the preparation for an open schism. He was accused of sheltering a deacon, named Felix, charged with having written a seditious letter against Maxentius: he refused—unwarrantably, as we should say—to give up Felix into the hands of the government, and was forthwith summoned to Rome. Before he sailed, he deposited with some of the " elders of the people "—leading laics who held an official position as churchwardens (and were quite unlike the " lay elders " of Presbyterianism)—a large number of gold and silver vessels belonging to his church; and left an inventory of them in the hands of an old woman, with orders that if he did not return, they were to pass to the next occupant

of the see. He never did return: he satisfied Maxentius by his explanations, but he died, it appears, on his way home.

This was in 311. The vacant bishopric had to be filled. Two priests of Carthage, Botrus and Celesius, or Celestius, aspired to the dignity, and in order to secure the appointment for one of themselves, contrived to prevent the Numidian bishops from being summoned, by way of keeping the matter in the hands of prelates nearer home. But their intrigues failed to gain their end. The archdeacon Cæcilian was chosen by the "suffrage," or "request,"—the strong testimony or expression of desire, as from St. Cyprian's writings we should interpret the terms, of the whole Carthaginian laity; and he was consecrated according to custom by bishops of neighbouring towns, including Felix of Aptunga or Autumna. The woman who had received from Mensurius the "*brevis*," or inventory, of Church treasures was faithful to her instructions, and delivered it, in presence of witnesses, to the new bishop of Carthage. He thereupon demanded the treasures from the lay "seniores;" but they, as Optatus expresses it, in his work "on the Donatist Schism," "had greedily swallowed what was entrusted to their keeping;" and then, in anger at the new bishop's demand, they inaugurated a schism, and were abetted by the two disappointed candidates, and by a rich and influential lady named Lucilla. She had a personal grievance against Cæcilian, whose temperament was averse to irregular enthusiasm: while he was archdeacon, he had reproved her for the habit of kissing the bone of a dead man, whom she regarded as a martyr, before she received the Holy Eucharist: as Optatus says, "she was rebuked for giving precedence over the Cup of Salvation to a bone of some dead man, and one who, if he were a martyr, was not yet approved as such; and she departed in wrath at being thus put to shame." The mortification rankled in her mind, and made her eager to compass, by her money and her influence, any possible revenge upon Cæcilian. And so it was that, as Optatus reckons, three elements—detected fraud, disappointed ambition, and wounded vanity—combined to organize an attack upon his episcopate, and to inaugurate the movement of Donatism.

The malcontents called to their aid some Numidian bishops, of whom Secundus, who had presided in the Council of Cirta, was the most conspicuous. According to a passage in St. Augustine's very curious "Psalmus contra partem Donati," they had already come to Carthage to take part in the appointment of a new bishop, and

were vexed to find Cæcilian already "ordained in his own see." They found him supported by the great body of the laity as well as of the clergy: he had possession of the church and altar used by previous bishops of Carthage. The Numidian bishops were entertained by the malcontents, and would not enter the cathedral. Cæcilian, hearing of their hostile intentions, sent a message to them: "If any man has any charge to make against me, let him come forward and prove it." At that time they did not urge anything against him personally, but they made the objection which became so famous and so important in the history of the subsequent controversy: "Felix, who consecrated you, is a Traditor; therefore your consecration is illegitimate." Cæcilian was said to have sent back a reply, which Augustine considers to be a mere sarcasm: "*If* my consecrators are Traditors, do you come yourselves and consecrate me." "Let him come," cried the surly Purpurius, who had turned so fiercely on Secundus in the Council of Cirta—"let him come to have hands laid upon him, and we will break his head by way of penance." The Churchmen prevented their bishop from trusting himself to such "ruffians;" and the Numidian prelates, who were nearly seventy in number, proceeded to act. The church and altar not being available, they met apart, and pronounced Cæcilian to be not legitimately bishop, because Felix was a Traditor, and because Cæcilian himself had, while yet archdeacon, prevented food from being carried to imprisoned confessors: it was even said that his agents had stood at the prison door with whips in their hands. This latter charge, which they now for the first time employed, was probably a gross exaggeration of Cæcilian's natural co-operation with his late bishop to check the rush of volunteering for martyrdom. If we ask how they came to take this extreme step on the ground of these two charges, we shall find that according to our authorities, Optatus and Augustine, some members of the "schismatic Council" were those very bishops who had managed, at Cirta, to stifle the inquiry into their conduct which Secundus was instituting: they felt that they had incurred the reputation of being Traditors; and they might wish at once to gratify Secundus, and to display their zeal against the offence of which they themselves had been accused. A much larger number would be swayed by the representations of Botrus and Celestius, acting on impetuous natures possessed by an honest abhorrence of cowardly unfaithfulness, and a genuine enthusiasm for Christian strictness. These men would eagerly respond to the speech of Marcian, one of their

number, who compared Traditors to those unfruitful branches which were to be cut away from the Vine. We must not, however, ignore the presence, in some cases at least, of a far lower motive; we know that some members of the synod which condemned Cæcilian were simply bribed by the gold of Lucilla, who spent a very considerable sum in thus promoting the purity of the Church. They were, says Augustine, "bought and instigated" by her to strike this blow at the man who, years before, had galled her by rebuke; and elsewhere he says with a curious pun that Nundinarius, a Donatist deacon, had "exposed all the marketings" (*nundinas*) of Lucilla. The see of Carthage was treated as vacant; and a former Reader named Majorinus, now attached to Lucilla's household, was consecrated as bishop by the Numidians, including Silvanus of Cirta. Thus was "altar set up against altar," and a formal schism begun. Letters were written to nearly all the bishops of Africa, denouncing Cæcilian and his consecrators, and demanding the recognition of Majorinus; and many, "in good faith relying on" the statements in these letters, were, as St. Augustine expresses it, "alienated from Cæcilian." The churches beyond the sea adhered to his communion, and ignored Majorinus as a pretender and schismatic. Some account of the feud, from a quarter friendly to Cæcilian, had reached Constantine when, in the spring of 318, he wrote, as we have seen, two letters to Anulinus, the proconsul of the "old province" of Africa, respecting the restitution of Church property and the exemption of the Catholic clergy from civic office-bearing, and also one to Cæcilian as bishop of Carthage. For in this latter epistle, after mentioning the sum to be distributed by Cæcilian's instrumentality, among the clergy named in a particular list, the Emperor proceeds to say that he has been informed of the attempts of "some men of unsettled mind to pervert the people of the most holy and Catholic Church by a certain base falsification;" that he has written to Anulinus, and to Patricius, the "Vicar" for Africa of the prætorian prefect of Italy, ordering them not to tolerate such proceedings: that Cæcilian, therefore, may unhesitatingly invoke the support of the provincial government. Anulinus signified the Imperial orders about exemption of clerics "to Cæcilian and those who acted under him;" but took no cognisance of Majorinus and his supporters. The latter were naturally irritated; and a few days after, some of the bishops of the party, with a "great body" of lay adherents, presented to Anulinus a sealed packet with a leather covering, superscribed,

"Statement of the Catholic Church containing charges against Cæcilian, given in by the party of Majorinus;" and also, attached to this, an unsealed "libellus" or statement. Both these documents they earnestly requested the proconsul to forward to Constantine. He did so on April 15, 313, taking care at the same time not to prejudice the existing position of Cæcilian. Part at least of the contents of the unsealed "libellus" were as follows: "We entreat you, Constantine, most excellent Emperor, since you come of a just race, and your father, (alone) among the emperors, never persecuted, and Gaul is free from this crime" (of delivering up the Scriptures), "whereas in Africa there are contentions between us and the other bishops,—we beg your Piety to appoint judges for us from Gaul." This was signed, for the prelates "of the party of Majorinus," by five of their number: the name of Donatus, apparently, was not put forward; but the bishop of "Black Huts," who had begun to disturb the peace of the Church in the days of Mensurius, must be regarded as one of the most energetic leaders of the present schism, although *the* Donatus, who was known as "the Great," and was schismatic bishop of Carthage, belongs to a later time.

The documents reached Constantine while he was in Gaul, perhaps at his favourite city of Treves. Greatly annoyed, he yet determined to grant the request of the petitioners. He summoned Cæcilian to come to Rome, with ten bishops whom he might select as his supporters: he ordered ten others of the opposite party to appear and bring forward their charges; and he wrote, forwarding also copies of the "libelli" received from Anulinus, to Miltiades, incorrectly called Melchiades, "bishop of the Romans," and to "Marcus," whom Valesius supposes to be a presbyter of Rome, afterwards Pope, and Tillemont identifies with Myrocles, bishop of Milan. This letter, preserved in a Greek version by Eusebius, expresses the Emperor's vexation at finding divisions rife among the bishops and people of the African provinces, which "Divine Providence had willed to entrust to his devotedness;" and intimating his desire to prevent "all schism and dissension," out of "regard for the Catholic Church," informs Miltiades and Marcus that they are to hear and decide the case in conformity to "the most venerable law" of Christianity, and to "justice," and in conjunction with three bishops, Rheticius, Maternus, Marinus—respectively bishops of Autun, Cologne, and Arles—to whom similar letters, with copies of the necessary documents, were at the same time addressed. Of these three prelates, Rheticius (a

predecessor, we observe, of Talleyrand!) was the most eminent, and St. Augustine cites some remarkable words of his on baptism as the "principalis indulgentia:" St. Jerome ranks him among the famous men of his time, and mentions two of his works. Constantine afterwards added seven other bishops to the proposed court of inquiry, and this number, as we shall presently see, must have been further increased. Thus opened another scene in the strange drama. It was not the first occasion, strictly speaking, of an appeal to the sovereign for justice from one of the ecclesiastical parties: Aurelian had been invoked by the Catholic prelates and clergy to expel the condemned heresiarch, Paul of Samosata, from the "church-house" of Antioch. Nor can the "party of Majorinus" be accused of having on this occasion set a precedent for undue interference on the part of the civil power; for as in Paul's case "civil rights were involved in an ecclesiastical judgment," so this appeal to Constantine related to "facts, not to doctrine:" he is asked to appoint judges of the case, and he does so as the natural guardian of public tranquillity, although he is careful to profess, at the same time, his respect for the Church of which he was yet in no sense a member. He orders the parties to "come before a tribunal of bishops."

And now we must, in imagination, transport ourselves to the south-eastern corner of Rome, and the slope of the Cælian hill just within the Asinarian Gate, where the senatorial family of the Laterani, one of whom was put to death for conspiring against Nero, had owned what Juvenal calls a "splendid house," part of which had come into the hands of Maximian, and of his daughter Fausta, Constantine's wife, from whom it took the style of "Domus Faustæ," but transmitted to all time its old name of "Lateranum." As if in anticipation of the time when the dwelling was made over to Pope Silvester by the *true* "Donation of Constantine," and the earliest basilica of "Our Saviour in the Lateran" was endowed by his munificence, the "Domus Faustæ" was assigned for the hearing of this important cause: the prelates who actually formed the court were nineteen in number, for it had been resolved to enlarge the tribunal, and increase its moral weight, by the addition of bishops from various towns of Italy. One can picture the disgust, not unmingled with alarm, which must have been legible in many faces of the high Pagan society of the capital, at seeing that proud aristocratic and Cæsarean mansion constrained by the Emperor's orders, during his absence,

to open its doors, for a solemn judicial process, to the chiefs of a "superstition" the more hateful because no longer to be despised.

So it was that before the Council, or court of bishops, here assembled, accusers and accused stood face to face, on Friday, October 2, 313. No advantage was allowed to Cæcilian: a full and fair investigation took place; and the prosecution, which was mainly conducted by Donatus of Casæ Nigræ, was discredited by the offences brought home to him and others, and then broke down under the failure of the evidence adduced against the defendant. On the first day of sitting, it appeared that Donatus had been a stirrer-up of faction while Cæcilian was only archdeacon; and he avowed that he had rebaptized and reordained some bishops who had lapsed in the persecution. On the other hand, the witnesses brought forward against Cæcilian owned that they had no facts to attest; and the judges would not admit as evidence the clamours raised against him by the least respectable of the followers of his rival. It was then pretended that there were other witnesses important for the case, who had come to Rome, but whom Donatus, for his own reasons, had hindered from appearing. "They should appear on the next day:" he repeatedly promised to produce them. The next day came, but instead of these witnesses, there appeared some persons with a "libellus" of charges against Cæcilian, which were examined and found wanting. The accusers had recourse to the fact that as many as seventy bishops had condemned Cæcilian; but the judges replied that a large number of men acting in disregard of judicial principles was of no greater moment than a small one. Cæcilian had been condemned unheard; that fact proved the judgment to be worthless, though ever so many had concurred in pronouncing it. The third sitting ended the trial. The Pope and his colleagues (we may use the word "Pope" as a matter of convenience) pronounced Cæcilian innocent. "Since," said Miltiades, "nothing has been proved against him by the party of Donatus in conformity to what they undertook, I am of opinion that he ought to be maintained in full possession of ecclesiastical fellowship. But," he added, "excepting only Donatus, the originator of the mischief, the others who have opposed Cæcilian may, if they choose, enjoy the peace of the Church; nay, I am ready to send letters of communion to bishops consecrated by Majorinus, and to consent that where there are now two rival bishops, the one who was first

consecrated shall hold the see, and the other be provided for elsewhere." This proposal is praised by Augustine as emanating from "a true son of Christian peace, a true father of Christian people," but is doubtless to be taken as the general sentence of the whole synod, Miltiades as president speaking last, and Augustine repeatedly mentions the "judgment of the bishops;" and again, "After the pacific resolution of the episcopal tribunal, all pertinacity of contention and animosity ought to have been extinguished." But it was not so. Donatus and Cæcilian were both desired, in the interests of peace, not at once to return to Africa. Cæcilian, by Constantine's orders, repaired to Brescia; Donatus soon obtained leave to go to Africa, on condition of not visiting Carthage. Two bishops, Eunomius and Olympius, were sent by the Council, or by Miltiades, to Carthage, charged to "pronounce" or declare authoritatively, as Optatus expressed it, "*where*," that is, with whom, "*the Catholic Church was;*" to "promulgate," in short, "the decisions of the synod." They were violently opposed by the partisans of Majorinus; "daily disturbances" happened: at length the envoys did their errand, gave sentence that "the Church" in Africa was that which was in communion with other Churches, communicated with Cæcilian's clergy, and returned to Italy. Donatus then went to Carthage; whereupon Cæcilian speedily quitted Brescia, and returned home.

The schismatics renewed their complaints to Constantine. They sent deputies to him, to denounce Cæcilian as unfit to be a bishop. "That is nonsense," said the Emperor: "the case has been settled at Rome, by thoroughly competent judges." They persisted, saying that the bishops at Rome had passed a hasty judgment within closed doors, omitting some important points in the case. "What of Felix of Aptunga? the little council of nineteen bishops never examined the question whether he was a Traditor; and *that* question lies at the root of all." We may observe in passing that the idea of a supreme judicial authority in the Roman bishop alone never occurred to either party. "Wearied out," says Augustine, "by their daily importunities," Constantine ordered Verus, the vice-prefect of Africa, to hold a regular inquiry into the case of Felix. Verus being ill, the duty was performed by the proconsul Ælianus with all strictness and severity: part of the "gesta" are extant, and from them it appears that one Maximus was, so to speak, counsel for the schismatics, and Apronianus for Felix, and that a very important witness was one Alfius

Cæcilianus, an old gentleman who had been "duumvir" or local magistrate in 303, and as such had been obliged to carry out the mandate for the seizure of Christian "Scriptures." He had, in that capacity, taken away the episcopal chair from the church of Aptunga, with some "letters of salutation;" and had sent (as the Christians had already done) to the house of Felix, in order to find "Scriptures" there. Felix was absent. Nothing more passed at the time. But, some years later, when one Maurus had simoniacally obtained the see of Utica, Felix, in a sermon, declared that no one ought to communicate with him, because of his "fraud;" whereupon an ædile's clerk, named Ingentius, being a friend of Maurus, said by way of recrimination, "And let no one communicate with *you* either, for you are a Traditor!" He then proceeded to Aptunga, determined to *make* evidence, if necessary, for his charge. He called on Alfius Cæcilianus, who was taking his breakfast with his workmen; declined an invitation to share the meal, and, on being asked his business, began to say, "I am come to find out whether any Scriptures were burnt in the year when you were duumvir." Cæcilianus, who was clearly a man of honour, answered, "You annoy me; you are a spy—take yourself off." Ingentius departed, but returned with the ædile Augentius, whose clerk he had been, and they presented a supposed letter from Felix with an oral message, both to be communicated to Cæcilian, and to this purpose: "I have in charge eleven valuable Scripture 'codices,' which I am called upon to restore to their owner; I don't want to part with them, and in order to avoid doing so, I would be glad if you, my friend, would say that they were burned during your duumvirate." Cæcilianus, not suspecting any plot, was indignant at this "specimen of the good faith of Christians;" but was induced by Augentius to dictate a short note for Felix, in which he simply said that, at the time referred to, certain "letters of salutation" were given up by a Christian named Galatius, and ended by a courteous hope that Felix might be "in good health for many years." To this note Ingentius fraudulently added a longer paragraph, tending to implicate Felix by making Cæcilianus remind him that he, Felix, had handed over to him the church key, and bidden him "take away any books or papers which he might find, but not the stores of oil and wheat:" whereupon, the forgery proceeded, "I told you that any building found to contain books had to be pulled down; you Felix) then asked what you should do? and I said, 'Let one of

your people place the books in the cemetery where you Christians offer up prayers, and I will come with the police and take them off,' which we did accordingly." When this addition was read to Cæcilianus, he protested that he had never "dictated it," that it was a forgery; his own note had stopped short with the wish for Felix's health. Ingentius, who at the time of the inquiry was a decurion or common councillor, was summoned, examined, fastened to the rack, and "being threatened" with torture, confessed that "he *had* added it to the letter." He was condemned to imprisonment, in order to stricter examination; and the proconsul pronounced "the religious bishop Felix" to be wholly guiltless of the offence alleged, the burning or surrendering of the "deifica instrumenta:" there was no evidence that "any Scriptures had been found, or spoilt, or burnt," or that Felix had ever, directly or indirectly, been concerned in anything of the kind. Such was the "Purgatio" of Felix, obtained by means of the detection of Ingentius's malignant forgery. The inquiry took place on February 15, 314; Ælianus communicated the result to Constantine, who, somewhat later, ordered Probianus, the successor of Ælianus, to send Ingentius to his court, as a living refutation, after this inquiry, of the charge laid against the consecrator of Cæcilian.

But the Emperor had resolved that the case should be definitively treated by a large assembly of Western bishops. Nothing short of this, he thought, would avail to silence the controversy: and he naturally hated controversies, not from the feelings which might animate a Churchman who valued the spiritual blessings of unity, but from a sovereign's intolerance of what interfered with the quiet of his dominions, and also from the vexation which, as a patron of the Christian community *ab extra*, he would feel at seeing disorders among his clients. And so we find him expressing himself in the letter to Ælafius or Ablavius (perhaps now "Vicarius" of Africa), which announced his will that Cæcilian, with some of his colleagues, whom he himself should select, and some of his adversaries, and also some episcopal representatives of each of the African provinces, with such persons as they might associate with themselves, should be conveyed at the public cost, that is, by carriages and horses forming the "*cursus publicus*," or postal service provided at the cost of the treasury, and by the shortest route, through Spain to Arles, so as to arrive there before the 1st of August, when the whole case should be fully and finally examined and decided. It was, the Emperor wrote, too bad that these

dissensions and altercations should continue: they would, in all likelihood, incense "the most high Divinity" against the empire and himself; and they were so much material for cavil against the "holy observance" of the Catholic religion, which would be too easily disparaged, on that account, by "men who were known to turn their minds away from it." He also wrote letters summoning a large number of bishops to the proposed Council. Eusebius has preserved one, addressed to Chrestus of Syracuse, which recites the main facts of the case as regards the calling of the Roman Council and the persistency of the partisans of Majorinus in rejecting its decision as the hasty judgment of a few,—remarks on the advantage thus given to adversaries of "the most holy religion,"—and then sets forth the imperial purpose in desiring Chrestus to repair to Arles, with two of "the second seat," *i.e.* presbyters (whose seats on each side of the bishop were somewhat lower than his own), and three servants to attend on them during their journey, and there to take part in a large council of bishops assembled from all quarters. The letter clearly shows that Constantine called this council, not because he thought there was any reasonable ground for the re-hearing of the case, but in order that malcontents who ought to have been satisfied by the Roman Council might "even now, at last, be recalled to brotherly unanimity."

The old Gallic town Ar-laeth, "on the Marsh," at that time intersected by branches of the Rhone, and by a number of small lagoons or sea-inlets which made its situation like that of Venice, was now the princely city of Arelate, which had long been eminent as a "colony" among the Roman towns of Southern Gaul, and had shared in the intellectual activities of "The Province," and given birth to a professor or "sophist," Favorinus, distinguished by the friendship of Hadrian. Constantius I. had resided there; and his son took a strong interest in the city, which he attempted to associate with himself by naming it "Constantina." It became the seat of the "Præfectus Prætorio" of "the Gauls;" Ausonius, in the latter part of the century, described it as a "Gallula Roma:" and its Roman character is still grandly represented by an amphitheatre of Hadrian's time, a theatre begun by Augustus, and a cemetery which is still, in Dante's phrase, "thick-spread" with Roman "sepulchres," and retains its euphemistic name of "Elysian Fields" under the disguise of "Aliscamps." A melancholy place now, with decay "writ large" over its very streets, as well as over

its ruins,— Arles was then rising to a greatness which culminated within a century after its first Council; and Honorius, when decreeing that it should be the seat of a representative assembly of "seven provinces" of Southern Gaul, recommended it as "enriched by its commerce with whatever was goodliest in the world," an expansion of Ausonius's phrase, "Romani commercia suscipis urbis." The time at which Christianity first came to Arles is not ascertainable: that the Trophimus of the apostolic age brought it thither was the assertion made by its very discreditable bishop Patroclus, in the early part of the fifth century, to Pope Zosimus, who heaped favours on Arles because the story or legend, ignoring St. Paul's language, and obeying the law of "Petrine" development, represented Trophimus as deriving his mission from St. Peter. But it seems certain that, in Archbishop Benson's words, "there was no bishop of Arles before the death of St. Irenæus:" and although *a* Trophimus is reckoned by Gregory of Tours as one of the seven missionary bishops whom, on the warrant of a record of martyrdom, he describes as sent from Rome into Gaul in A.D. 250 (a year in whch no such mission was possible), and is named by him as first bishop of Arles, the story cannot be reconciled with Cyprian's letter of 254; for Marcianus, who had recently become a Novatianist, had for some time occupied the see, and was evidently chief bishop of "the Province:" so that for once a legend post-dates a historical event. The present cathedral of "St. Trophimus," with its solemn Romanesque interior, is interesting as representing the basilica in which Hilary of Arles, and Cæsarius, officiated, and in which also Augustine of Canterbury was consecrated by its Archbishop Virgilius in 597. The church of Arles, whenever founded, was in Constantine's time conspicuous and dignified; and thus it was fittingly chosen to receive the "plenarium concilium" of the whole Church of the West, which assembled on the appointed day, August 1, 314,—the first of the thirteen Councils of Arles, and by far the most important and memorable. Among its members were Rheticius and Maternus, Agræcius, the newly appointed bishop of imperial "Treveri," Oresius of Marseilles, Avitianus of Rouen, Ambitausus of Reims, Vocius of Lyons, Verus of Vienne (the city associated with Lyons in the persecution of 177), Merocles or Myrocles of Milan, Theodore of Aquileia, Proterius of Capua, Chrestus of Syracuse, Cæcilian of Carthage (supported by seven African colleagues), Liberius of Emerita in Spain, and three British prelates, Eborius

of York, Restitutus of London ("de Civitate Londinensi), and Adelfius, most probably of Lindum Colonia or Lincoln (the text speaks of "Colonia Londinensium)." The whole number present is uncertain, only thirty-three names being given in the synodal letter: but the list in the Concilia called "Nomina Episcoporum" includes the names of some other bishops, who probably had left Arles when the letter was drafted, and mentions eleven cases in which absent bishops were represented by clerics; among these one is surprised to find not only Ostia, but the not distant Tarragona and Saragossa, and even the neighbouring city of Orange. The list names four presbyters, who appear among the signatories of the letter, and ignores three of the signatories: of its fifteen presbyters, twenty-six deacons, two readers, and seven exorcists, the majority were evidently in attendance on their bishops, as Severus on Myrocles, a presbyter and four deacons on Marinus, Sperantius on Cæcilian, Florus on Chrestus, Sacerdos and Arminius on Adelphius, etc. Marinus of Arles presided. The deputies of the Roman bishop Silvester, who had succeeded Miltiades on the 31st of January this year, were two priests, Claudian and Vito, and two deacons, Eugenius and Cyriacus. The first business, of course, was the case of Cæcilian: it was examined, and he was again declared guiltless. He had again confronted his accusers: again their proofs had been found worthless; so that, in the language of the synodal letter, "by the judgment of God and of the Mother Church, who knows and approves her own, they were either condemned or repulsed." Some, indeed, of those who had opposed Cæcilian were induced by the proceedings at Arles to "return into unity with him;" and it appeared that the Council made or sanctioned some such proposal as that those bishops of the party who should abandon their schism should be allowed to share the episcopate of their several cities with the bishops of Cæcilian's communion—in a word, with the Catholic bishops—until one or the other should die: a remarkable divergence, in the interest of peace, from the received principle of diocesan episcopacy.

Two or three of the canons of this Council require special notice. One touched the Easter-question, which had first arisen in the second century, and will be best considered in connexion with the Nicene Council; but it used very general language, simply enacting that all should keep "the Lord's Paschal feast" on the same day, to be announced, as usual, by the Roman Church

for every year. Another definitively disallowed the African or Cyprianic rule of ignoring heretics' baptism as invalid, and re-baptizing accordingly converts who had received it: every one who had been baptized in the name of the Trinity was to be treated as a christened person, and brought to "imposition of hands," or, in our phrase, to confirmation; but if it appeared that he had been baptized in some other form, he must be baptized *de novo*. It is to this decision of a "plenary council" of the whole West that Augustine often refers in controversy with the Donatists. A third, while excluding from the clergy persons proved to have been Traditors, recognizes as valid the ordination which bishops of this class have conferred. There are also rules disapproving of usury, chariot-races, and theatrical performances, recognising the religious lawfulness, for Christians, of military service, of civic office, and provincial governorship, with the provision that they must fulfil their Christian obligations, and accept the counsel of the local bishop; allowing those who are converted during illness to receive imposition of hands (so as to be admitted to the catechumenate); excluding from communion for a time Christian girls who had married Pagans, and denying communion to penitent apostates during illness; restraining clerics from changing their sphere of ministry; strictly forbidding deacons to "offer" the Eucharist; repressing the self-assertion of deacons of *cities;* requiring a plurality of bishops for a new consecration; and tersely ordering "that no bishop shall trample on another," *i.e.* treat him with injurious contempt. A canon referring to adultery on a wife's part presents difficulties which need not be discussed here.

The bishops, in their formal letter to Silvester, lamented his absence, but owned that he could not leave the place "where the Apostles daily sit, and where their blood unceasingly bears witness to the glory of God;" in other words, the Church of Rome was recognised as possessing the episcopate founded by Peter and Paul, and the spots where they suffered martyrdom. But more difficult and remarkable is the phrase that Silvester "holds the greater dioceses," and therefore can most readily publish the announcement of Easter. What is meant by "qui *majores diœceses* tenes"? The empire had been divided by Diocletian, for administrative purposes, into twelve great regions called "dioceses," which, as Professor Bury has shown, became thirteen in the course of the fourth century; so that the term which we now apply to the ecclesiastical district in the charge of a single bishop—then known

as a "parish," by a mode of speech of which we find survivals even in Bede—was used for a group of so many civil provinces which was ruled by a "Vicarius," etc., and eventually placed with other such groups under the superior oversight of one of four "prefects," whose original relation to military affairs was nominally represented by the epithet "prætorian." Thus the Eastern prefecture contained the dioceses of "the East" (with Egypt), of "Asia," Pontus, and Thrace: the Illyrian contained the dioceses of Mœsia—afterwards subdivided into Dacia and Macedonia—and of Pannonia, afterwards included in the Italic. The Gallic extended from the northern limit of Roman Britain to the Straits of Gibraltar; and at first the diocese of Gaul proper (equivalent to North France) was distinct from that of "Vienne," which was afterwards united to it. The Italian prefecture had peculiarities of its own. It included the six provinces of "Africa" —ultimately the seven of Western Illyricum—and those of Italy, which may be distinguished as the North-Italian, ruled by the Vicarius (or Vice-prefect) of "Italy," and the Central and Southern, administered by the "Vicarius Urbis;" while the great "city" itself, and its neighbourhood, were under a special prefect, whose office dated from the reign of Augustus. In what sense, then, could the bishop of Rome be said "to hold the greater dioceses"? He was not patriarch, to use a subsequent term, in any part of the East; his authority to reverse local decisions was long afterwards denied by the Church of Africa. Nor does the letter imply that he was owned as in any sense *supreme* over the Gallic Church; still less, if possible, was he so regarded by the Christians of Britain. The Churches of North Italy looked practically rather to Milan than to Rome; and Spain does not seem to have had any special ties to the "see of Peter." And, to come to the point, there appears good reason for connecting this expression with an older use of the term "diocese," as equivalent to a province, or a part of a province, or a district—a sense in which it was used by Cicero. Then the Council will mean to say that Silvester's ecclesiastical relation to the Churches of the ten Italian provinces under the government of the "Vicarius Urbis" (who, observe, was subordinate to the prætorian prefect of Italy, not to the prefect of Rome) might give him exceptional facilities for acting as an organ of communication with distant Churches. These provinces were, in more senses than one, "majores;" they contained the "eternal" city, the centre of the Roman world, to which, as Dr. Liddon has

said, "all the streams of human effort converged," and from which radiated throughout the empire multitudinous lines of intercourse; they were wealthy, populous, and central: he who governed their Churches might be said to be the chief pastor of the most favoured and dignified portions of the empire; and his opportunities of dispersing information would be in proportion to the conspicuousness of his position in the Church. The bishops proceed to summarize the first, second, third, fourth, sixth, seventh, and eighth canons, and conclude with curious abruptness, which suggests that something has dropped out of the text. "Then he (Constantine), being tired of it, ordered all to return to their own sees. Amen."

To return for a short time to the history of what we may now call by its familiar name of Donatism. The great body of Cæcilian's adversaries were as obstinate as ever in their discontent. They were not the least overawed by the authority of the Council of Arles. "They appealed (*provocârunt*)," says Augustine, "in their extreme pertinacity and litigiousness, to the Emperor against the Council." Hereupon Constantine wrote to his "dearest brothers," the Catholic bishops at Arles, a letter more positively Christian in tone than those which had preceded it—acknowledged that God's mercies towards him were alike indescribable and undeserved; expressed his pleasure in the result of their just decision in bringing back some sectarians to Catholic unity, and his disgust at the renewed demands which the others had preferred for fresh inquiry, and inquiry to be conducted by the Emperor himself in person. "Incredible arrogance! They demand a judgment from me, whereas I myself await the judgment of Christ. For I say the very truth—the judgment of the bishops ought to be so regarded as if it were pronounced by the Lord in person. These malignants look out for what is secular, abandoning what is heavenly. They have copied the fashions of Gentile litigants by lodging an appeal!" After more in this strain, he turns the bent of his letter into a request that the bishops, "following in the path of the Saviour," will wait patiently a little longer at Arles, in order to offer favourable terms to any one who will even yet reconsider their position; if this meets with no response, they may return to their respective Churches "and remember me, that our Saviour may always have mercy on me." He adds that the obstinate "perverters of religion" are by his orders to be sent at once to his court. But this interesting letter was followed by no slight concession to the persons denounced

in it. As Augustine says, he was "overcome by their importunity." The Donatists all but prevailed on him, by some of their leading men whom he had sent for to Treves in the spring of 315, to hold a new inquiry in Africa by means of Commissioners. However, on further reflection, he resolved to hold it at his own court, and promised the Donatist bishops that if they could bring home to Cæcilian one single charge, he would hold it as equivalent to the establishment of all. He summoned both parties to Rome. Cæcilian, for some reason not mentioned, was not forthcoming. Constantine, although beset by demands that he should be condemned as contumacious, simply gave orders that the inquiry should be transferred to Milan. Thereupon some of the Donatists returned to Africa. Constantine for a time thought of visiting Africa for the purpose of adjudicating the cause; but he found that this was impracticable, and summoned Cæcilian to Milan. The bishop went thither, wearied, no doubt, and disappointed, but judging it best not to disobey again. The investigation, which was conducted, says Augustine, with all care and diligence, ended as usual: and Constantine wrote to Eumalius, the "Vicarius" of the six "African" provinces, telling him how he had found Cæcilian to be "a man thoroughly blameless, fulfilling the duties of his religion;" a verdict implying, as Augustine says, that no such crime could be found in him as had been falsely alleged in his absence by his enemies. The letter was written on the 10th of November, 316, and Constantine's wrath at the obstinacy of the false accusers found vent at first in a hasty impulse to send them to execution; but he thought better of it, perhaps under the influence of Hosius, simply banished them, confiscated their property, and took away the Churches which they occupied. This act, however, failed to relieve him from the trouble: the Donatists in a memorial told him that they would never communicate with "that scoundrelly bishop of his," and in weary disgust he recalled his sentence of exile, and left the case to "the judgment of God." With this final declaration, this "indulgentia ignominiosissima," of Constantine may be closed the first portion of a repulsive but suggestive tale of faction and violence, combined, no doubt, in some cases, with elements of character which might have been turned to good account, but were all marred by want of fairness, not to speak of want of charity. These men, whose coarse and bitter partisanship so offends us, included some who had a zeal that "even consumed" them for the discipline of the Church: they had, no doubt, as Hooker allows, an ideal, in their better moments,

of a Church which should be all-glorious in its purity. They were scandalized by the intrusion, actual or supposed, of grave sin into the sacred precinct; they insisted that it should be driven out at once and at any cost. But, as Cowper most truly said, "there is no grace that the spirit of self can counterfeit with more success than religious zeal," none that can more readily accept "the wrath of man" as its instrument; and when thus detached from its proper moral correctives, it becomes a mere turbid, self-deceiving impulse, which may at any time hurry the zealot into an abyss of reckless truculence, and reproduce among Christians the atrocities of unchristian fanaticism. Something, no doubt, must be allowed for the sullen, gloomy, "black-blooded" temper which distinguished many of the African provincials, producing a disposition to violence, and a hardness literally inhuman. Those savage peasants, whom Donatists, some years later, stirred up to harass the African Church —the ruffians who went about blending wrath against the Church of "Traditors" with a wild revolutionary movement against land-owners and creditors; those hideous "Circumcellions" who were somewhat akin, at least, to the "Sicarii," and nearly as ferocious as the leaders of a "Jacquerie"—were phenomena from which, no doubt, the simple credulous rigorists who first accepted the story of "Felix the Traditor" would have recoiled in terror and abhorrence. So again, the intense, almost insane self-assertion of "Donatus the Greater," who succeeded "Donatus the Elder" in the leadership, and bore himself as if he were actual sovereign of Carthage, uniting an arrogance like that of Paul of Samosata with Arianizing sympathies which would be another point of resemblance,—this might seem a development of worldly-mindedness which could be no natural fruit of an enthusiasm for Christian intensity. More might be said as to the indomitable contentiousness and obstinate resistance to evidence which the sect showed in the days when it wearied the great heart of St. Augustine. But the upshot and moral of the history is, that any excesses of pride, or cruelty, or bitterness, or baseness, are possible to those movements which begin by earnestness without humility, and separate indignation against evil from the natural virtue of justice and the evangelical grace of love.

CHAPTER III.

THE COUNCILS OF ANCYRA AND NEOCÆSAREA.

THE return of peaceful times to the Church in Asia gave facilities for the holding of two Councils, of which the first is assigned to the same year with the Council of Arles, and which met at Ancyra and Neocæsarea.

The city of Ancyra, in North Galatia, had become the capital of the whole Galatian province. It stood, says Professor Ramsay, "in a picturesque and very strong position;" and it was "the middle point of the great highway from Byzantium into Syria, and the emporium of Oriental caravan traffic." It possessed a grand marble temple, built in honour of Augustus, and an inscription recording his acts. The Jews were, in his reign, an important part of its population; and he had ordered his decree in their favour to be set up in "that conspicuous place which had been set up in his honour by the Community of Asia at Ancyra." We meet with its name in the early history of Montanism, where the anonymous anti-Montanist writer, cited so largely by Eusebius, says that he "discoursed many days in the church at Ancyra on the points urged by the adherents of Montanus," and the presbyters of Ancyra wished him to leave with them some records of addresses which had "gladdened and confirmed" the minds of the faithful.

To this city, about the Easter festival of 314, or perhaps in the fourth week after Easter, came some eighteen prelates from the different parts of Asia Minor and Syria. Vitalis of Antioch, as the highest in rank, probably presided; another eminent prelate was Basil of Amasea, who is said to have afterwards suffered martyrdom: but the one whose name is best known is the bishop of Ancyra, that unfortunate Marcellus who, in the Arian controversy, gave such trouble to his friends by appearing, at least, to adopt a line of opposition to Arianism which was itself heretical in

an opposite direction; and next to him, a Basil who was the best representative of that "Semi-Arian" view which might seem to be rather verbally than intelligently heterodox. The chief purpose of the episcopal gathering was to provide for the treatment of the Lapsi of the late persecution. Not much need be said about its canons. Cases of apostasy were classified. We find that some presbyters had sacrificed to idols, and had then renewed their profession of Christianity, but had made a private arrangement with the officials that they should merely go through the form of being submitted to torture. Some clerics or laics had taken part in an idolatrous feast, had "dined in presence of idols," and this under severe pressure, yet all the while had put on an appearance of cheerfulness or indifference; others had wept persistently, and worn a mourning habit; others had sat at the feast, but refused to taste anything, or had resorted to the subterfuge of bringing and eating their own food. Some Churchmen had not only lapsed, but had pressed others to share in their apostasy. Various penances are assigned to various classes. We hear of three orders or grades of penitents: the Hearers, who might listen to the reading of Scripture; the Kneelers, who might join in certain prayers; and the Co-standers, who stayed throughout the Eucharistic service, and were only restricted from actual communion. And we read of some who needed no penance, who had had incense thrust into their hands beside an altar, or part of the "idol-sacrifice" thrust into their mouths, but who at the time and afterwards had unequivocally expressed their Christian faith. Another canon is important in regard to the function of the "Chorepiscopi," or bishops of rural districts. The reading is disputed, but probably comes to this: "It is not permitted to country bishops to ordain presbyters or deacons—" then, with an accusative and not a dative, "nor truly city presbyters either (or, 'and certainly not city presbyters'), without the written permission of the bishop, in another 'parish'" (or diocese), or perhaps, "in each parish." The other reading, which is adduced as making the canon say, "it is not permitted to country bishops, nor even *to* city presbyters" (to ordain, etc.), rests chiefly on the authority of Latin versions, whereas the Greek manuscripts support the accusative, as is shown in a learned paper in the third volume of *Studia Biblica*. It is not unlikely that the dative was adopted under the notion that the accusative in that second clause was an erroneous iteration of the accusative in the first. But which reading is intrinsically the more probable?

Were the Chorepiscopi real bishops, or, as were some in the West in the latter half of the fourth century, presbyters holding an office like that of a rural dean? Apparently those in the East had received episcopal consecration, but on the understanding that they should be in strict subordination to the diocesan bishops. They were stationed in the "country-sides," to look after the scattered rural flocks: they are here directed not to confer orders even in their own districts, still less in the cities where the diocesan bishops dwell, without express warrant from the latter; the aim of the restriction being apparently to guard against a gradual dissolution of the unity of the diocesan Church. This being the object, one may ask first, Why should the canon here introduce a restriction applying to the action of a different class? One class of persons is forbidden (except under conditions) to do a particular act. If we read the dative, we must suppose that another class is suddenly, and in a dependent clause, placed under the same prohibition. This would seem to mar the simplicity and unity of the veto pronounced. Further, if we render, "it is not permitted to Chorepiscopi, nor even" (as Lightfoot takes it) "to city presbyters," this would suggest that city presbyters ranked higher than Chorepiscopi; whereas we see here that the latter had power to ordain, and there is no good evidence for such power as vested in presbyters; the evidence, rather, goes the other way. Another canon shows that churches, or "houses of the Lord," had, as such, certain property: if any part of it had been alienated, an incoming bishop might reclaim it. We also learn that in some cases persons appointed as bishops for particular towns were repulsed by popular feeling. The difficulty here is that, according to rule, a strong expression of acceptance, or even of desire, was a necessary pre-condition of the appointment of a bishop; he was not to be set over an "unwilling" people. The laity of the diocese had very full opportunity of signifying their opinions and wishes in such a case; and it would be very seldom that they were overruled by the provincial synod, as if they did not know what was best for them, or were too excitable and intractable to have their objections taken into account.

Again, the canons illustrate the general tone of feeling in regard to asceticism. The requirement of 1 Tim. iii. 2, 12 (in its natural sense) as to presbyters (called *episkopoi*) or deacons was not, indeed, extended to lay people; but still a second marriage on the part of a laic was deemed a weakness, a falling short of the higher tone of Christian life. At the same time, there is a clear

expression of the Church's mind as against the morbid and unchristian type of abstinence which had been prophetically censured by St. Paul, and had distinguished the Encratite sect (so called) in the second century. When it is ruled that clerics who are in the habit of abstaining from meat, or even from vegetables cooked with meat, must at least *taste* the meat set before them, by way of proving that their own practice has no relation to non-Christian ideas (such as were hinted at in 1 Tim. iv. 3) we are to understand a reference to the Agapæ or common meals in which Christians periodically shared by way of "love-feasts," which had been abused by the rich at Alexandria, and were now often—as at Rome—associated with the commemoration of martyrs, and held at or near their tombs.

The Council of Neocæsarea is commonly said to have been held but little later than the Ancyran. The Greek preface to its canon calls them subsequent to the Ancyran, but earlier than the Nicene. Some would assign it to the year after the Ancyran, *i.e.* A.D. 315; others would say a few years later. Nineteen bishops (including eleven who were present at Ancyra) subscribed this council's acts,—if the lists of names be trustworthy. The city of Neocæsarea, which "had begun to flourish from B.C. 64," was now "the large and beautiful capital" of Pontus. It had become illustrious, in the eyes of all Asiatic Christians, by the episcopate of Gregory surnamed "the Wonder-worker," who found there, says Basil, only seventeen Christians, and left there a convert population. Even if we could suppose that there was a basis of truth in those accounts of his supernatural powers which were first published about a century after his time, and at any rate have a legendary character, we should still believe that the moral beauty and nobleness of his pastoral life and labours were at least as impressive and fruitful as the presence of what, in the language of the apostolic age, would be called his "charismata" or visible "mighty works." The prelates who met at his city, probably just fifty years after his death, would find memorials of him at every point of the Church life of his people. Whether or not his dying wish had been obeyed, and no distinctive burial-place marked out for him—for he desired, we are told, to be "even after death a stranger and sojourner"—we may be sure that the whole city was practically his monument, and that his memory was "ever fresh" in his people's mind. His successors, whom Basil afterwards compared to "a chain of precious stones,"

had been careful to hand on the traditions of his teaching and his sanctity: "not a word, not an action, not a single point of ritual observance" which was traceable to his authority, had been altered since his time: the holyday rejoicings which he had transferred from heathen festivals to the anniversaries of martyrs were now, doubtless, invested by recent events (such as the hideous tortures inflicted on some Christians of Pontus) with a more vivid and intense, yet a more grave and awestruck exultation: in his formula of doxology, glory was ascribed "to the Father, with the Son, and with the Holy Spirit;" of his formula of faith, or creed, the autograph, written with "his blessed hand," as Gregory of Nyssa says, was preserved as a priceless treasure, and the words were daily used to instil the faith into the minds of the young, and to preserve the whole flock in the lines of intelligent orthodoxy. The church in which the Council now met was doubtless that of which Gregory had laid the foundations, and which "some one of his successors"—probably the bishop now occupying his seat—is said by Gregory of Nyssa to have completed and beautified; and altogether, the influence of him who was known in the Eastern Church of this century as "Gregory the Great" would be felt to have formed the whole moral atmosphere of the Pontic capital.

The Neocæsarean canons throw further light on the development of ascetic ideas. A presbyter is not to join in the wedding feast of a "digamist," because strictly he would be bound to put his entertainer to penance. A layman whose wife has dishonoured him ought not to be ordained; a priest who does not put away a faithless wife, or a priest who voluntarily confesses that before his ordination he fell into unchastity, ought no longer to celebrate. No priest ought to marry after his ordination: the meaning is, if he is already married, and is well qualified for priesthood, let him be ordained; but if at his ordination he is single, he must not afterwards accept the obligations of married life. This, as we know, was a rule of long standing at the time of the Nicene Council; it had grown out of such a one-sided construction of the apostolic advice in 1 Cor. vii. as would be fostered by recoil from the hideous pollutions of pagan society, amid which the idea of marriage itself had not yet been cleared of the "serpent's trail," had not vindicated its own pure dignity. Another canon excommunicates a woman who has married two brothers successively. This implies the moral obligatoriness of the Levitical prohibition; and it was quoted by Henry VIII.'s advocates in his Divorce case,

as representing the primitive Church's mind. Another recognises only two classes of Catechumens, Hearers the lower, and Kneelers the higher; and perhaps we may understand the canon as not marking off the class called "Competents," or joint applicants for speedy baptism. The Nicene canons speak of Hearer-Catechumens and Catechumens proper; and those who were afterwards distinguished as Competents would naturally, at first, be reckoned among the latter.

The twelfth is perhaps the most remarkable of all the decrees of Neocæsarea. "If any one be 'enlightened' when ill, he cannot be advanced to the order of presbyter (for his faith is not from free choice, but from necessity), unless, perchance, on account of his subsequent earnestness and faith, and of lack of men." This is the law—older than the middle of the third century, so far as regards its substance—which puts a distinct mark of disparagement on those cases of baptism (called "enlightenment" from Heb. vi. 4) in which the recipient had wilfully deferred receiving it, or neglected to apply for it, while in health, and then sought for it when the fear of death was upon him. Persons who so acted were called Clinics, or "men of the sick-bed," and were by rule debarred from ordination. Sometimes there would be a deliberate plan of deferring until death drew near, in order to pass out of the world with the full benefit of the baptismal cleansing. Those who so acted would make some enormous assumptions; as, that they would not be struck down by sudden death, and that they would not only in their last hour have time and means for being baptized, but, after years spent in deliberate self-exclusion from Christian grace, were sure to repent and "turn to the Lord;" they would also exhibit a revolting heartlessness in withholding from Him the service of their best years, and they would suggest the suspicion of trying to "make the best of both worlds" in a very unchristian sense. The practice would connect itself with a reverence "not according to knowledge" for the sanctity of baptism, and with an exaggerated conception of the heinousness of sinning after receiving it; and thus a show of religiousness would be attached to a postponement which the Church, by councils and fathers, denounced as flagrantly wrong. It had been branded by Tertullian as an "attempt to secure a furlough for sinning;" and in the latter part of the fourth century it was condemned on similar grounds by Basil and Gregory of Nazianzus.

Neocæsarea joins with Ancyra in giving us information about

Chorepiscopi. We find that the rural presbyters stood on a footing of inferiority to the city presbyters; and as they were unquestionably real presbyters, we see how the Chorepiscopi might be subordinate to the diocesans, and yet be really bishops, as really as our English "bishops-suffragan." A rural presbyter must not celebrate, nor even administer, where the city presbyters were present; he may only do so in their absence. But the Chorepiscopi, who are regarded as fellow-ministers with *the* bishops, although as prefigured by "the Seventy," may do what the rural presbyters may not do.

A curious and somewhat formalistic rule restricts the number of deacons even in a large city, to seven, and refers for a reason to Acts vi. Here we see that, as in the Ignatian Epistles, the diaconate is treated as a sacred order. The restriction, as we know from Cornelius of Rome, was observed there, and the result was unfortunate; for the seven Roman deacons in the midst of some fifty presbyters were tempted to exhibit a self-importance which aroused the indignation of Jerome.

CHAPTER IV.

LICINIUS AND CONSTANTINE.

It is probable that the Council of Neocæsarea was the last which was permitted to meet in Asia Minor until the final overthrow of Licinius. He had been unsuccessful in his first war with his colleague, and had been compelled to sue for peace, which was granted in the December of 314. This treaty left him master of Thrace, Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt, while it added to Constantine's dominions Greece and Macedonia, Pannonia, Dacia, and that Dalmatian region from which the Constantian house had sprung—a house now reigning, as Gibbon expresses it, "from the confines of Caledonia to the extremity of Peloponnesus." Licinius was not likely to forget his own humiliation. His "genius" had been "rebuked," his pride had been wounded, by the unfailing good fortune and energy of a prince much younger than himself, and that prince a patron of the Christians. And for Christians, both as enemies of the old-world ways, and as the natural well-wishers of the man whom he regarded with jealous dislike and resentment, the old comrade of Galerius entertained a stronger aversion than he could at first afford to show. He had taken part in the great Act of Toleration, and had so far seemed an "advocate of peace," and even "of true religion;" he had executed a terrific vengeance on the authors of an elaborate pagan imposture, and had been celebrated by Christian exultation as a signal instrument of Divine judgments on the root and stock of the persecutors. But in his heart, says Socrates, "he hated Christians," that is, as a disturbing element in society—for he had no pagan enthusiasm, and was too rude and illiterate to appreciate religious controversies: a new sect, a spreading "cultus," was to him a nuisance, and by its political bearings might become a peril; and although it might be politically necessary for him to practise

such dissimulation as was natural to his "perfidious character," he would be sure to throw off the mask at the first opportunity, and make these troublesome Christians feel that he would do them all the mischief in his power.

The time at which he began to harass them has not been distinctly ascertained. Jerome fixes one chief act of oppressiveness as late as the year 320; and Tillemont acquiesces in that date. For some time, no doubt, Licinius was cautious in his operations, and this would suggest a longer interval between the treaty of 314 and the attacks on his Christian subjects than Sozomen's language appears to allow. He seems to have felt somewhat as the French republicans felt towards the French "clericals," considered as hoping for a restoration of royalty; for he suspected that the Christians prayed in their churches to be brought under the sway of Constantine; and this would lead him to direct his first movement against the rulers of the Churches, who on other grounds, also, would be naturally the first to feel his hatred. On the whole it seems likely that at some time between 315 and 320 he began by prohibiting the bishops "to have any intercourse, in any place, with one another," to visit each other's churches, "or to hold synods and debates on matters of interest to the Church." So true was his instinct as to the value of such meetings to the good order and healthy life of the community which he had set himself to oppress, and ultimately, if possible, to destroy. He set the precedent which many a government has, since his time, thought good to follow by putting a legal impediment in the course of the Church's synodical action. It is as well that we should appreciate the full significance of his first hostile edict; and perhaps, among the many who quote the sensitive and despondent Nazianzen's avowal that he never saw a synod which did not add to the Church's troubles—an avowal followed by words (not so often quoted) which show that he deemed "seclusion" the only safeguard—there are few who remember or consider that the first regular law against Church Councils was the first step in a crafty and malignant tyrant's elaborate campaign against Church life, and drew forth from the somewhat "liberal" Eusebius the momentous observation, that men were compelled either to resist the State's command, or to violate the Church's "ordinances,—*for* great questions cannot be rightly decided otherwise than by synods."

Such was the first edict of Licinius. The second and third

were respectively embittered by an insult which recalled the obsolete and hideous heathen libels against the Church, and by a sarcasm in the style of Julian or of Frederick of Prussia. Licinius ordered, as if in the interests of morality, that Christian women should not go to church with the men, but worship apart under female teachers; and, this edict failing of success, he further directed, as if in the interests of health, that Christian congregations should assemble, not within their towns, but in the open space outside the gates, because the air there would be purer! It was, perhaps, after both these mandates had been treated with scorn, that Licinius ejected all his Christian servants from their situations in his household; and drove into exile, simply for their faith, men who had been most loyal to his person. Some others were mulcted of their property, or condemned to base and servile employments in the mines or other public works—a form of humiliating ill-treatment which had been one of the milder features of the great persecution, and has left its memory in the long detailed intercession in the Alexandrian Liturgy commonly called St. Mark's. By this time—in 320, according to Jerome's date, in his Chronicle, for the dismissal of Licinius's Christian servants—the hearts of those who, but six or seven years before, had been overflowing with the joy of final deliverance from heathen persecutors were now sobered and saddened by the prospect of fresh inflictions close at hand. They saw some of their brethren driven to seek shelter in the wilderness, and others cast into prison, where their friends were debarred from bringing them food or otherwise ministering to their necessity. They saw a fresh edict go forth, which must have thrilled them with the recollection of the fiery trial of Diocletian's reign, and of the yet worse days that followed it: all military officers who would not sacrifice to the gods were to be deprived of their rank in the Emperor's service. As if to complete the likeness of the new troubles to the old, churches were pulled down, or shut up with a prohibition against the Christians' use of them; every facility was given to local officials to insult and annoy Christian bishops. At last the instruments of Licinius, acting on their own assumption as to their master's secret wishes, proceeded to extremities, and in several cases to the ghastliest forms of cruelty. Eusebius speaks of some who were literally cut to pieces, and afterwards cast into the sea, "to become food for fishes." One of the bishops who suffered death was, by one account, Basil of Amasea, who had sat in the Ancyran and Neocæsarean Councils.

The bishop of another Neocæsarea, situated on the Euphrates, was treated in a manner thus described by Theodoret, who mentions him as a member of the Nicene Council. "Paul, the bishop of Neocæsarea (it is a stronghold on the banks of the Euphrates), experienced the wild rage of Licinius, for both his hands were disabled by the application of red-hot iron, which contracted and deadened the muscles of the joints." But one story of Christian endurance, connected with this local and partial, but bitter and trying persecution, is pre-eminently famous: it is the story of the Forty soldier-Martyrs of Sebaste, who, according to a tradition received by St. Basil, but, as we might expect, betraying the growth of exaggeration, refused to sacrifice to the gods, and were thereupon exposed naked to the piercing cold of a winter's night, being informed at the same time that by promising compliance they might at any moment have access to a hot bath. The pathetic interest of the tale lies in this, that one of them, after a while, accepted these terms; whereupon the soldier who acted as guard, under a sudden inspiration, took his place among the sufferers, whose prayer that "as forty had entered on the contest, so forty might win the crown," was thus fulfilled.

Licinius, throughout, avoided the position of an avowed religious persecutor. He oppressed the Christians because he chose to consider them disaffected and politically dangerous; but he did not proscribe their religion as such. Yet oppression is a test of character; and, limited as was the extent to which Licinius was permitted to vex the Church, before his plans were defeated by his second and fatal war with Constantine, there were in this period melancholy cases of weakness and of faithlessness, as when some yielded, in the words of the Nicene Council, "without any compulsion, danger, or loss of property," and some military officers, who had at first cheerfully laid aside their "belts" rather than satisfy the Emperor by sacrificing, soon afterwards "spent money, and won their readmission to the army by presents:" not to speak of the charge afterwards made by Constantine himself against one who was more than once his worst adviser, Eusebius of Nicomedia, that he, a bishop, had not only taken part with Licinius against Constantine, but had been accomplice in his "butcheries of true bishops"—a charge which it is impossible to admit as it stands, but which may have been founded on some instance of this prelate's habitual preference of secular interests to Christian fidelity. The days of trial passed by, perhaps, before either the

faithful or the faithless could fully estimate their prospects under Licinius. He was, we are told, "meditating a general persecution" when Constantine, in 323, made war upon him—for other reasons, doubtless, beside that which Eusebius mentions, his sympathy for the suffering Christians of the East. The end of that year saw the ruin of Licinius's cause; the next year saw his name added by Christians to the list of their dead foes. It was given out that, after accepting terms, he began secretly to plot against the victor; but such charges were pretty sure to be made against a defeated rival whose life had been guaranteed by a promise. He was put to death at Thessalonica in 324; and this final victory of the imperial friend of the Church and its ministers was naturally accompanied by a more open and emphatic association of Christian ideas and purposes with his personal and official life. The half-superstitious impression of a supreme Divine protection, attaching itself to all who took the Cross of Christ for their "saving sign," had by this time been evidently deepened, and, so to say, transformed into a truer and fuller recognition of the unearthly kingdom which that Cross represented; a conviction still far removed from single-hearted and unreserved self-devotion, and compatible not only with delay of baptism, and with official retention of some heathen forms—as the imperial title of Pontifex Maximus, or the celebration of "games" which were mixed with heathen rites—but with not a little of non-Christianity in tone and character, which Niebuhr was thinking of when he pronounced the well-known judgment, too epigrammatic to be equitable, "A repulsive phenomenon, and no Christian!" No Christian, we must indeed say, if the term be taken in its proper sense of one living under Christian grace, and swayed by Christian principle, or in the sense of one who, though not yet within the baptismal covenant, had resolved to commit himself absolutely to Christ, or had found a home and stay for heart and conscience in the spiritual depths and moral forces of Christianity. Not such was Constantine, either now or in later years of his strange life, when in some respects his character underwent a grave deterioration, as in the domestic tragedy of the execution of his son Crispus. Yet it would be unfair not to credit him, at this period, with some measure of what might be called Christian faith, sincere up to a point, although poor in tone, and far enough from being a life-renewing power; with a genuine appreciation of the Christian moral standard, and with a large-minded perception of the need of

a spiritual support for social order—of what an Emperor might gain from having a Church. For he was a man of great ideas; he knew a great thing when he saw it; and he appreciated the greatness of the Christian religion, as organized in a universal Church. He was impressed by the strange force which had carried it through many a fiery trial, by the new strength which it had given to the principle of moral authority, by its capacity for becoming a civil as well as a spiritual bond of union. And when we take account of his glaring inconsistencies, we must remember how many persons in that transition-time held partial relations with the Church of Christ, and were actually, to a certain extent, Christianized; and how Constantine, belonging to that class, was specially impeded in his advance to higher things by the difficulties of a position such as no other monarch ever occupied, and which must never be lost sight of in any estimate of his conduct. So, when we turn with some disgust from Eusebius's fulsome eulogies on the piety of a prince who delivered sermons to his court, and tried to pronounce on Christian controversies, without having as much as given in his name as a catechumen—when we justly consider that in this respect the courtly Church historian exhibited himself as somewhat lacking in moral dignity, and set a mischievous precedent for clerical obsequiousness—we must still, in all fairness, make large allowance for the dazzling fascination of such a phenomenon as an Augustus who did not simply tolerate the Christian religion, but spoke of it in terms of increasing cordiality and respect, heaped substantial favours on its official representatives, even espoused the side of Catholics against schismatics, and generally set himself to promote the advancement of the Christian cause. If he assumed, as he repeatedly did, the tone of a "patron" of the Church long before he became one of its members, he partly drifted by force of circumstances into that position, and was partly led into it by ecclesiastics whose heads, so to speak, had been somewhat turned by an astonishing experience. As to his enactments, he had abolished the punishment of crucifixion two years after the first war with Licinius. He had, so to say, transformed the ceremony of manumission of slaves into a quasi-Christian act, in all cases affecting Christian slave-holders, by allowing it to be performed in churches, "in the presence of the prelates of the Christians," and, in that case, with some abridgment of legal forms. It was not going beyond the line of heathen emperors to forbid, as in 319 he had

forbidden, any private consultation of "Haruspices," by invitation of them into a Roman citizen's house, as "friends" and advisers; the public consultation he still permitted, but in terms expressive of contempt for those who should "desire" in this way "to gratify their own superstition." Two years later, a law promulgated at Aquileia denounced all such magical practices as aimed at injuring persons or depraving minds; but at the same time tolerated what our fathers called "white" witchcraft, employed for cure of disease, or protection of vines from bad weather (as distinct from what was called "Goetic"). He had shown that a growing zeal for the interests of Christianity was accompanied with a growing earnestness against much that was immoral and inhuman in the social life of Rome. Thus slaves were secured from *extreme* cruelty; prison-life, which had been such an element of suffering in the persecutions, was rendered less intolerable; justice to accused persons was enforced; the rights of children, of women, of celibates, were recognised in legislation; and it is pleasant to find the Emperor, in 316, forbidding drivers in the "cursus publicus" to overtask their animals by the use of heavy sticks—a whip with a little string, such as may "admonish by a harmless tickling," is as much as his humanity will allow. He had exempted the Catholic churches from tribute, and renewed, in 319, a previous exemption of clerics from the burden of civic functions; but had taken care to guard against the possible abuse of such immunity by ordering, in 320, that in future no one who was sufficiently well off to serve as a "decurion," or provincial town-councillor, should get himself made a cleric, and that if any, since the promulgation of his first law on the subject, had thus shunned the "public duties" (*obsequia*), he should be separated from the clerical "corporation," and take his share of civil office. Such edicts as these illustrate the increasing onerousness of those hereditary obligations which ultimately turned the "curiæ" of towns into "mere gaols" (as Hodgkin expresses it), "in which the middle classes were shut up from birth till death, to toil for the imperial tyranny"—gaols from which their attempts to escape were barred by pitiless legislation. Again, Constantine had granted full permission to "any man whatever" to bequeath anything whatever to "the most holy and venerable council" (that is, community) "of the Catholic Church." And he had forbidden, on penalty of "fustigation," or of a heavy mulct, in case the offender was too high in rank to be punished—any adherents of a different religion to force Catholics, lay or

clerical, to attend the lustral sacrifices. The most famous, perhaps, of his laws of this period, affecting religion in any measure, is one which, in March, 321, commanded all judges, and city populations, and artisans—but, on account of the crops, exempted country people from the obligation—to "rest on the venerable day of the Sun;" an order followed up, in the June of that same year, by another law which, after reciting that it had already been thought "most unseemly that the venerated day of the Sun should be taken up with any contentious business," proceeded to say that it was well-pleasing and agreeable that on that day should be performed such business as met the wishes of the persons concerned, such as emancipation and manumission of slaves, which, accordingly, might be freely transacted on "the festal day." Constantine did not stop here: he had abstained, indeed, in referring to the "Dies Solis," from any language which was distinctively Christian, and the prayer which he ordered his soldiers to recite on Sunday was simply Theistic, beginning, "Te solum agnoscimus Deum;" his coins, bearing "the figure of the Sun-god and the inscription *Sol Invictus*," might suggest "that he could not bear to relinquish the patronage of the bright luminary," which afterwards, in his own statue at Constantinople, was strangely associated with the crucified Sun of Righteousness; but it was a stronger step to carry a tent-church with him in his campaigns, and to originate the custom of each legion having such a tent, provided with its ministering clergy. If, in addition to the law about Sunday, he ordered, as Eusebius (followed by Sozomen) tells us that he did, the observance of Friday, in memory of the work of salvation, one must suppose that *this* order was addressed to his Christian subjects alone.

With such enactments in remembrance, the Eastern Christians who hailed his final victory over Licinius would have reason enough for their "ceaseless plaudits in honour of Constantine the Conqueror," and their exulting anticipations of a brilliant *Christian* monarchy established in the dynasty which now presided over the entire Roman world. They would look at each other, as Eusebius says, "no longer with melancholy faces, but with smiles and bright-eyed gladness," especially as they read their new sovereign's ordinance addressed to the provincials of Palestine. He began by dwelling on the success which had been granted to the faithful servants of that "Supreme Being whose servant he was proud to be," and whose providence had led him to his present eminence;

INTERNATIONAL CHRISTIAN
GRADUATE UNIVERSITY

he dilated on the misery which had overtaken the persecutors, and the honours which the martyrs had won; and then, observing that it would be most absurd that those who persevered in the worship of God should not find advantage under one who had been employed as God's instrument, he proceeded to take order for the relief of all who had suffered under the late persecution. The exiles were to be recalled from their "dreary homelessness," whether imposed as the alternative of sinful conformity, or inflicted by the decree which (following the precedent set in the case of Flavia Domitilla under Domitian, and that of Pontianus and Hippolytus in 235) condemned some to detention in islands; the confiscated property of Christians was to be restored; those who had unjustly been placed on the roll of "Curiales," or sent to toil in the mines, or set to ignominious work in women's apartments or linen factories by way of insult to their nobility, were all to be freed from the oppressions to which they had been subject. The stamp of legal "infamy" should be effaced; the confessors who had resigned military rank should have "the option" of resuming it, or of receiving an "honourable dismissal;" the enslaved should be free men again; the property of martyrs should go to their next of kin—failing such, to the "local church;" their wills, if they have made any, should take effect; farms, houses, gardens, *ought* to be restored by their present possessors (excepting always the actual produce raised during their occupancy) to the legitimate Christian owners; the State itself would set an example in this respect, for the Church should have her own again from the Imperial treasury, and it would be a welcome task to restore to her the places honoured by the burial of martyrs; finally, all individual purchasers of churches should, on duly restoring them, be reimbursed by the Emperor's liberality—an exact repetition of a provision in the Milanese edict. The letter concluded with an exhortation to devout recognition of the Divine power; and Eusebius adds that the Emperor proceeded to appoint Christians to vacant provincial governorships, and to forbid heathen governors, even in the highest præfectorial rank, to sacrifice, *i.e.* to give their official countenance to sacrifices. He then tells us that a law was promulgated, "prohibiting the abhorred idolatry which went on, in former times in cities and country;" so that "no one was to presume to erect statues, or practise divination, or perform any sacrifice at all;" and speaking of a later period in the reign of Constantine, Eusebius, in his third book, describes a general

overthrow of temples and images carried out by the Emperor's agents at his command. Similar statements, on the whole, are made by later writers; but it is impossible to take Eusebius's account as proving an absolute extirpation of paganism, for no such change can be said to have been seriously attempted before the reign of Theodosius I. In fact, Constantine's own edict, "To all the Easterns," guarantees freedom of worship to pagans; and the utmost that could have happened under Constantine would seem to be the strict execution, by Christian state-officers, of existing laws against unlicensed superstitions, the countenance given to local outbreaks of iconoclastic zeal on the part of a Christian majority, the demolition of not a few temples especially abhorrent to moral as well as distinctively Christian feeling by their notoriety as strongholds and shrines of infamous profligacy,—and perhaps, at the end of his reign, some edict in general terms forbidding sacrifices of a non-Roman type. And while this work was taken in hand, Constantine wrote to Eusebius and other prelates, as to his "beloved brethren," urging them to promote the rebuilding of ruined churches, and the erection of new ones on a larger scale, the expense of which was to be undertaken by the government. Eusebius transcribes another edict, "To all the Provincials of the East." It was obviously composed for Constantine by some ecclesiastic versed in the rhetorical style of argument common in the Greek schools of that age. The Emperor fully adopted it, and wrote it out with his own hand; but was not likely to have originated, for instance, the studied exordium on the evidence for Theism furnished by "whatever is comprehended within the supreme laws of nature," and on the providential ordering which employs wickedness for the probation and rewarding of virtue. The Imperial assailant of Polytheism proceeds to contrast his mild and religious father with the persecuting tyrants: he calls God, the Most High, to witness that he himself heard Diocletian ask for an explanation of the oracle of Apollo, "that the just men on the earth prevented him from uttering the truth," the explanation being at once given, "that the just meant the Christians," and the result being the promulgation of laws "written as it were with bloody sword-points," and a persecution which "made the earth weep, and darkened the very daylight with horror." After adverting, as usual, to the ruin of the persecutors, "condemned to perpetual punishment in the depths of Acheron," Constantine invokes "the holy God of the universe"—whose ensign has led him

to victory, whose "Name he sincerely loves, whose power he devoutly dreads, and whose holy house he is labouring to restore" —to be propitious to "his own Easterns." In the form of a prayer, he announces his desire that Christians and heathens should live side by side in peace, in "a renewal of intercourse which may prove effectual in leading the wanderers into the right way. Let no one molest his neighbour. Let every one do what he himself chooses." Those who reject Christianity "may have their temple-grounds of falsehood, if they please: *we* occupy the radiant house of Thy truth!" That truth is, essentially, as old as the creation; it was republished, to reclaim men from error, by means of the Son of God. Next, the Emperor—having just alluded to Christ, and no more—recurs to the attestation of Divine Providence by the fabric of nature, which bespeaks a sustaining Hand; and in conclusion, once more impresses on his subjects the necessity of mutual toleration. "Let no one be led by his own convictions to hurt his neighbour." The rumour of an entire destruction of heathen temples is, he says, unfounded: he would have advised all men thus to root out "the power of darkness," had not ingrained prejudice been too powerful; he has spoken plainly, because he would not hide his real belief; "but it is one thing to enter willingly on the struggle for immortality, another to force the unwilling into it." Such, says Eusebius, was the address which the Emperor, "like a loud-voiced herald of God," put forth to all the Easterns, "to draw them off from diabolic error, and to urge them to pursue the true religion." He was interrupted in these benevolent endeavours by the first news of the great Arian controversy. Enough has now been said to show how Licinius struck, with what force he had time to put in motion, at the ever-advancing Power which had withstood Galerius's more formidable onslaught; and how the triumph of Constantine, uniting the East and the West, gave to that Power the assistance of a more avowed Imperial co-operation. It was but gradually that Christians could apprehend the limitations of such assistance, or even the new risks and the subtle temptations which adhered to it: the danger of allowing the kingdom of Christ to be turned into a kingdom of this world. Nor could they see at once—well for them that they could not!—the stiff resistance which the leaven of the Gospel would encounter; the intractableness of much of the material on which Christianity was to operate; the tenacity with which paganism had inwoven itself into every form of secular

life; the proud self-satisfaction of Roman aristocrats, the vicious frivolity of Greek populations. Had such a distressing, bewildering vision been allowed to burst upon them all at once, their faith might in too many cases have reeled under the shock, and assumed that the promise had come utterly to an end. But here, as in other cases, "the distant scene" was kept out of sight, and men were led on step by step, with strength sufficient for the needs of the day.

CHAPTER V.

THE BEGINNINGS OF ARIANISM.

We have now to watch the gathering of a great controversial storm, which speedily dispelled the fond hopes of those who had expected that after the cessation of pagan persecution the bark of the Church would float easily through smooth waters. It was not to be: a long day of trouble, rebuke, and blasphemy was at hand —a period of "scandals" which would put the sorest strain on trustful hopes, on persistent endurance, on practical adhesion to a sacred Cause; which would cause love to wax cold, and would grievously impede the progress of Christianity; but which would also train heroes of faith and "scribes well instructed," and vivify, enrich, and consolidate the Christian conception of belief in Christ as God's "own" and only Son. Our scene opens at Alexandria, where the martyred Peter (whose death is dated on November 29, 311) had been succeeded, perhaps in 312, by Achillas, and Achillas, after a few months' episcopate, by Alexander (312 or 313). This prelate had had to encounter opposition from the very outset. To explain its cause, we must go back to the very first years of the fourth century.

There was a bishopric of Lycopolis, on the northern boundary of the Thebaid, which "appears to have possessed some honorary pre-eminence among" the other sees which were subordinate to the "Evangelist's throne" at Alexandria. Here, in A.D. 300, sat a bishop named Meletius, whose character has been always more or less of a problem; although there is no doubt of his having originated a schismatical movement, the grounds which he took up—the motives of his conduct—have been very variously stated. Athanasius (writing apparently in 356) says that it is fifty-five years since Meletius began his schism, and thirty-six since the Meletians were condemned; and in another work tells us that he

began it because he had been condemned in a council, by Peter, for various offences, particularly for an act of apostasy during persecution. Epiphanius, who evidently relied on some Meletian documents of a partisan character, represents Meletius as a brave confessor who suffered imprisonment with Peter, and in a discussion with him on the right mode of treating those who had lapsed, expressed a strong opinion against receiving them to penance until the persecution had been for some time over, and they had given sufficient evidence of genuine contrition; whereas Peter, "being tender-hearted," urged a gentler line of proceeding, and at last, when the pursuit grew hot, spread out his *pallium* or cloak on the floor of the prison, and bade the brethren go on this or that side of it, as they agreed with himself or with Meletius. He thereupon found himself, says Epiphanius, left in a minority: and so the schism began, and was kept up under Alexander (whom Epiphanius imagined to have been Peter's immediate successor). Meletius, banished to the mines, organized a "Church of Martyrs" by constituting bishops and clergy, and after his release still kept up private religious meetings with his own friends, although on terms of personal friendship with Alexander. The documents to which Epiphanius had referred are in various ways self-convicted of untrustworthiness: but it is to be observed, that the Nicene Council, in a formal letter to the Egyptian Church, is silent about the accusation of apostasy, and dwells only on the "disorderly and impetuous" conduct of Meletius; and also that a letter of Phileas and three other bishops to Meletius, first published by Scipio Maffei at Verona in 1738, rebukes Meletius for ignoring "the law of our fathers," and disregarding the dignity of "the great bishop Peter," by ordaining clergy outside the bounds of his own diocese, on the pretext that persecution made it necessary thus to provide new pastors for desolate flocks: to which letter an anonymous narrator appends the statement, that Meletius, after receiving this remonstrance, did not go to visit the bishops who had sent it from their prison, but after their martyrdom repaired to Alexandria, and there, supported by Isidore, "a turbulent man who desired to be a teacher," and by Arius, pretended to excommunicate the presbyters whom Peter had appointed to take the oversight of his Church, and ordained two men, one in prison, one in a mine,—whereupon Peter wrote a brief letter to his flock, ordering them not to communicate with Meletius, until he himself, "with wise men," could

take cognizance of the matter. Such are the various accounts of the origin of that Meletian schism or party which actually retained some life as late as the middle of the eighth century. And if we may accept as genuine the documents last quoted, commonly called the Maffeian Fragments, we shall certainly be disposed to think that Athanasius, when, many years after the event, he spoke of Meletius as having been condemned for apostasy, was giving credit to a serious misstatement—in its first form, perhaps, an exaggeration of the fact that Meletius was rebuked for a breach of ecclesiastical order, by confessors who soon afterwards became martyrs; and also that his date for the origin of the schism is perhaps five years too early. The Epiphanian account, representing Meletius as a zealot for discipline, and Peter as swayed towards laxity by his benevolence, betrays, plainly enough, a Meletian romancer's hand.

Whatever were the actual circumstances under which the bishop of Lycopolis was drawn into a sectarian position, we may take it as pretty certain that he became a schismatic during the persecution; and that Arius, afterwards the great heresiarch, espoused his cause. According to one account, Arius for a while abandoned Meletius, and was ordained deacon by Peter; but when Peter proceeded to severities against the Meletians—refusing to admit their baptism—Arius "exclaimed against this conduct of the bishop," and was consequently excommunicated. Under Achillas—who, like Peter, was an object of Meletian invective—Arius regained his position in the Church, on making his submission to the bishop. He was even advanced to the priesthood, and put in charge of the oldest church in Alexandria, which bore the name of Baucalis. It must be here observed that there were at this time several churches in the city, as those called after Bishops Dionysius, Annianus, Pierius, Serapion, etc., and what we now call the parochial system was already established, "for," says Epiphanius, "every church had its own presbyter appointed over it,"—as at Rome the churches (now only twenty-five) had long been distinguished as *tituli* or incumbencies, with clergy severally assigned to and "fixed" in each—the original idea of the term "cardinal."

So stood matters at the death of Achillas: then, according to Theodoret, Arius put forward his pretensions to the vacant see, and was greatly mortified by the preference given to Alexander. One is bound, however, to suspect these stories—by no means uncommon—which ascribe the first movements of a great heretical

career (for instance, that of Valentinus the Gnostic) to the impulse of wounded personal feeling. For some time, at any rate, after the accession of Alexander, he had no difficulty with the priest of the Baucalis church, and is said, indeed, to have "held him in high esteem." He had much business and some trouble on his hands: there was the building of a large and new church in memory of Bishop Theonas, which, we are told, he used before it could actually be dedicated; there was the appointment of bishops to various sees, the names of some of whom are recorded by Athanasius, in connection with the sufferings which they lived to endure in the days of Arian tyranny; there was a sharp controversy with a person named Crescentius, as to the right time for observing Easter; and there was the now established and intensified system of attack carried on by the Meletians, who denounced Alexander to "the Emperor," probably the Eastern sovereign Licinius. But, withal, there were for the good and kind-hearted bishop resources of support and comfort, and prospects full of hope, opening before him as he watched the expanding intellect and ripening moral force of a youth whom he had taken up—attracted, no doubt, by the evident promise of a high vocation, by unequivocal tokens of qualifications for doing the cause of Christ great service—and had received into his house, as his confidential secretary and deacon. It was no small privilege, no small happiness for Alexander, to have opened the ecclesiastical career to Athanasius.

It was not until 319—some six years after Alexander's accession—that he began, as it seems, to hear of strange language being held in Alexandrian Church society by the distinguished logician and highly esteemed preacher, who, after a period of misdirected and factious activity, had won for himself a considerable name for strictness of life and theological ability, as pastor of the church of Baucalis. Arius was a man of mark even in his outward characteristics: he was known by the sleeveless tunic and scanty half-cloak which he constantly wore, by his tall person, his melancholy thoughtful face, his grave manner, his sweet impressive voice, his social attractiveness and signal powers of conversation. Personally as well as officially, he had great opportunities for bringing his mind to bear on others; and he "went about from house to house," energetically propagating opinions which caused, by degrees, a vehement excitement, in regard to the nature of the Son of God. It came to the bishop's knowledge that Arius was disturbing the faith of some over whom he had gained an influence, as to the

uncreate and eternal being of the Divine Redeemer. He was speaking of Him as, after all, only the eldest and highest of creatures; not denying to Him the title of God, but by limitations and glosses abating its real power. Alexander thought it a duty to try the effect of remonstrance: he was loth to regard his presbyter as committed to a heresy of such flagrant character, and he waited some time, as it seems, before taking any step which should precipitate, or even necessitate, a breach. At last he sent for him, but the interview produced no effect, for Arius renewed the dissemination of his opinions, and, having by this time secured a considerable amount of support, preached without disguise the negation of the Son's eternal Divinity. The agitation daily increased, and Alexander, it seems, was blamed by some zealous Churchmen for indecision at a grave crisis. He thereupon summoned a meeting of his clergy, but even then spoke with great moderation, in the hope of reclaiming Arius, allowing freedom of expression on both sides. The meeting broke up without result. At an adjourned meeting Alexander deemed it high time to speak out, and addressed his clergy on the subject of the Holy Trinity in terms which Arius boldly and directly challenged, as involving a Sabellian conception of the "Son" as a power put forth from the One Personal God, a mode or form of His self-manifestation.

Now, the name of Sabellianism was odious, especially in a church which had special reason for venerating the memory of Dionysius the Great, who, as bishop of Alexandria, had contended earnestly, and endured misrepresentation in the contest, against the theory which sacrificed, so to speak, the Son's personality to His oneness with the Father, and thus, as he expressed it, involved "unbelief" as to the Only-begotten: as we might say, which involved all the revealed relations of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in confusion and unreality. Hence Arius had shown himself a master of controversial policy, when he resolved to adopt as his war-cry, "No Sabellianism!" He proceeded to show himself a master of dialectic fencing, when he argued thus from the admitted fact of the Sonship. "If the Son of God is a real *Son*, then what is true in all cases of paternal and filial relationship is true in this case. But what is true in regard to such relationship is, that a father exists before a son. Therefore, the Divine Father existed before the Divine Son. Therefore, once the Son of God did not exist. Therefore, He was made, like all creatures, of an essence or being which previously had been non-existent."

Here was Arius, then, laying down at the outset a rationalistic proposition, to the effect that he could argue irresistibly from human sonship to Divine; that the resources of human logic were fully equal to the discussion of matters so transcendental, and that there was no occasion for hesitating about such a use of such a criterion. Then he proceeded to infer, from his major premiss, the non-eternity of the Son's existence; and this conducted him, with perfect legitimacy, to the exclusion of the Son, thus produced in time, from the absolute incommunicable majesty of the One Uncreated Being. That the Son was *not Eternal*, and *not Uncreate*, were therefore the two original elements of Arian doctrine. The question as to what led Arius to the formation of these opinions may, perhaps, be never completely solved. We may ascribe something to the Alexandrian development of Platonic ideas, about the relation of "Mind" to the absolute Deity, as a "demiurgic" power acting for the primary unknowable "One:" yet Arius's tone of mind is hardly that of a Platonist. To connect him, as Newman does, with the Antiochene heresy inaugurated by Paul of Samosata, and for a time upheld by the much-respected Lucian, is a proceeding sanctioned, in part, by an extant letter of Arius, in which Lucian is referred to as his instructor. Still one must observe in the first place, that the rapid growth of his school in Egypt points back to Egyptian forms of thought, which exaggerated what has been infelicitously called the Filial "Subordination" (a term suggesting more than *Subordinatio*), and which would naturally tell on his own mind, as we know that his followers claimed Origen as on their side in regard to some language hardly consistent with the doctrine of the Son's Divine Co-equality. In the second place, there is a great gap between Paul of Samosata, with his notion of an impersonal Logos temporarily residing in a mere human saint, who, by moral "advancement," wins the title of God's Son—and Arius, with his notion of a personal Divine Son, towering high in antiquity of origin and dignity of position above the highest Archangels, yet still separated by the impassable gulf of creaturely being from the Supreme Essence of Him who was, in the full sense of the phrase, the only God, the one Almighty, and in whose presence all creatures as such were on a par. A still greater difference, perhaps, must be recognised between the position of Arius and that of Artemon or Artemas, who was sometimes called the true founder of his heresy. And yet it is undeniable that the temper of mind which conspicuously

determined the course of Paul or of Artemon, and which, for convenience, we may designate as rationalistic, was the same that originated the hard, self-confident, and pretentiously logical propositions to which Arius gave utterance at Alexandria. He seems to have been lacking in reverence, keenly disputatious, impatient of mystery, prone to see contradictions where other minds would see only parallel truths incapable of being logically harmonized; and without assigning too much weight to such motives as pique or repugnance to episcopal authority, one may at least suppose that the consciousness of being opposed to his official superior, for whose intellectual abilities he had probably small respect, would contribute something to the interest which he would take in formulating a theory of his own connected with philosophic conceptions of an Ingenerate Supreme, and escaping the difficulties which he found in the dominant belief.

Such were the "preparations" of his theory. Its immediate groundworks were, as we have seen, these two—a dread of Sabellianism, and an assumption as to the conditions of Divine Sonship; and its essential propositions were these two, that the Son had not existed from eternity, and that He differed from other creatures in degree, and not in kind.

The second sitting of the clerical conference broke up, like the first, without coming to any definitive result. It is worth while to remember that "hierarchical pressure" had been conspicuous by its absence. Alexander had allowed full liberty for the expression of opinions; and if he himself had spoken plainly, he had suffered himself to be contradicted, and even rebuked as unsound, without taking any official resolution. We can hardly wonder that many thought that, in this, the bishop had carried forbearance too far. One of the city presbyters, named Colluthus, considered him to have betrayed the cause of faith by this tolerance of grave error, and thereupon set up a sect of his own, and ventured, on the ground of "the necessities of the time," to confer a sectarian ordination. But it is important to observe that, according to the testimony of the clergy of the Mareotic district in 335, he "pretended to be a bishop;" so that if this is to be taken literally, we are not concerned with a claim to confer orders in the character of a presbyter. One of the persons who were in this manner declared "presbyters" was named Ischyras; he will reappear in the history of the Arians' persecution of Athanasius. Colluthus added to this schismatical proceeding the advocacy of a strange theory, traceable evidently

to an ill-instructed zeal for God's honour, such as drove him into separation from his bishop: he taught that the afflictions of life, which in that sense are called "evils," do not come from the Divine hand.

By the end of the year 319, matters had reached a point which forbade all hope of peace. Private remonstrance and open discussion had been tried without success, and Alexander thus found that he must act officially: there were several presbyters and deacons, and a large number of dedicated virgins, together with not a few laymen, who had come to regard Arius as a better theologian than their bishop. Accordingly, Alexander assembled the presbyters and deacons of Alexandria and the adjacent Mareotic district, and without formally excommunicating Arius, caused them, or the majority of them, to sign a solemn letter, in which he exhorted the followers of Arius "to renounce his impiety, and submit themselves to the sound Catholic faith;" and he followed up this censure by assembling the bishops, nearly a hundred in number, who owed obedience to his see. This episcopal synod was held, according to Tillemont, either at the end of 319 or the beginning of 320; but Hussey, on the authority of Jerome's Chronicle, dates it in 321. Arius and his adherents were present, and on being questioned as to what they really held, avowed the following opinions:—

1. God was not always Father, but became so when He produced His Son out of nothing. For—

2. The Son was produced in the sense of being created;

3. He was a creature, and therefore once He did not exist;

4. Therefore, He is not like the Father in essence;

5. Nor is He the Father's true Word or Wisdom, but can be called so only in an improper sense, as being in fact the product of God's true Wisdom, *i.e.* of that attribute whereby God made both the Son and the Universe.

6. And, in truth, the Son was created with a view to the creation of mankind: He was God's destined instrument in our creation; He would not have existed at all, had not God willed to make us.

7. Further, the Son does not perfectly or accurately know either the Father or His own essence;

8. And, like all rational creatures, He is by nature capable of change.

When it came to this point, one of the bishops, taking advantage of the ethical sense of mutability, put a question, "Could

the Son of God, then, change, as the devil changed, from goodness to evil?" And the Arians, or perhaps one outspoken Arian, did not hesitate to answer, "Yes, He could have thus changed; for His nature, being created, was capable of change." We must needs suppose that this referred to an original, not to a present possibility. The question meant, Was it abstractedly possible that the Son should have joined the rebellious angels? Arianism, by treating Him as a created moral being, implied that this was possible; and the fatal admission thus drawn forth decided the Council to excommunicate and anathematize Arius and his adherents, who were the following:—

Two bishops: Secundus and Theonas.

Six priests: Arius himself, another Arius, Achillas, Aithales, Carpones, Sarmates.

Six deacons: Euzoius, Lucius, Julius, Menas, Helladius, Caius.

This excommunication of Arius and his companions is the first landmark, closing a distinct portion of the history of the movement. The second portion extends from this point to the Council of Nicæa.

The immediate result of the Council of Alexandria was an increase of ferment among the minds of Egyptian Church-people. Not a few held with Arius on the question at issue; others thought that he had been unfairly treated by authority, and a division took place between such persons and the orthodox, which was not allayed by the withdrawal of Arius, and several of his friends, as Carpones and Achillas, from Alexandria to Palestine. If, as he himself asserted, he was actually banished by his bishop, it would not be a stronger step than was taken by Demetrius in regard to Origen. Whatever may be thought of Origen's theological eccentricities, it is painful even to put the two names in juxtaposition; yet we cannot help doing so at this point, for Arius, like Origen, found shelter and support in Palestine, and especially at the hands of Paulinus of Tyre, and Eusebius the historian, bishop of Cæsarea. He professed to desire nothing but peace, to be no heretic, no innovator, but a man injuriously treated by his own bishop, with whom, notwithstanding, he longed to be again in communion. He therefore applied for the good offices of several bishops: would they not write to Alexander in his behalf, and send to himself letters of communion? Some did so, from a *bonâ fide* belief that he had been misunderstood and misjudged; others, from a real sympathy with his opinions; but a few of those whom he addressed

resisted all his representations, and among these was Macarius, bishop of "Ælia" or Jerusalem. Alexander, on hearing of the countenance given by several prelates to Arius, wrote to remonstrate with them; we are told that one of his seventy extant letters was addressed to Eusebius of Cæsarea, others to the bishops Asclepas of Gaza, Longinus of Ascalon, Macrinus of Jamnia, Zeno of Tyre. Some of the bishops, in reply, denied that they had countenanced Arius; others said that they had done so on imperfect information; others protested that they had wished to "reclaim" him by "kindly treatment;" but he, for his part, was now securing for himself a more powerful friend than any that Palestine could supply in the person of Eusebius of Nicomedia.

This prelate, whom an English Church historian describes as "one of the most hateful characters" in history, but who rather deserves our pity for having been exposed to corrupting influences which he was ill prepared to resist, had been irregularly transferred from the see of Berytus to that of the present Eastern capital—the fifth city, in point of size, in the empire. He was an astute and able politician, who had had many years of experience of public life; he had gone great lengths in supporting Licinius's government, even when it assumed a hostile aspect towards Christianity; and Licinius's wife Constantia, sister of Constantine, was probably instrumental in procuring his translation. Philostorgius, the Arian historian, called him "the Great;" Sozomen speaks of him as a "man of learning," as well as "of high reputation in the palace;" and he appears to have been imbued from a considerably earlier period with the ideas which Arius had recently expressed. To him, as to a "fellow-Lucianist"—a fellow-pupil of Lucian of Antioch—Arius addressed a letter by the hands of a person whom he calls his "father" Ammonius, then about to leave Palestine for Nicomedia. He informed Eusebius that Alexander had "persecuted and expelled" him for not believing in the eternity of the Son, and in His eternal or continuous "generation" from the Father. This doctrine he identifies with the notion of the Son's being *unbegotten;* in other words, he contended that a real "generation" of the Son must be an event which happened at a certain period, and that to make it a perpetual fact of the Divine existence was to annul its reality. He sneered at Alexander as if he had called the Son "ingenerately generate;" that is, he took up the sense of "without beginning," philosophically attached to *agennetos* or ingenerate, and inferred that as the Father was

"unbegotten," He alone was eternal; whereas, on the Catholic view, the Son was "generate" in the sense of having His origin in the Father, yet "ingenerate" in the sense of sharing the Father's eternity. Moreover, while describing the Son as "perfect God," which was flagrantly to misuse terms, and even adding that He existed as unchangeable, which was a correction of the incautious admission made at the late synod, Arius intimated that to accept Alexander's dogma would be to make the Son "a part of God," and therefore, in effect, no Son at all. Eusebius's answer contained, no doubt, an invitation to Nicomedia; it also contained a distinct approval of Arius's sentiments—"for, plainly, what was made had no existence before its making."

To Nicomedia, then, we must now follow Arius. The splendid city which Diocletian had so loved, and had raised, in "a few years, to a degree of magnificence which might appear to have required the labour of ages," and which contained a palace of his erection—the city, also, which had witnessed the outbreak of the great persecution in the tortures of the Emperor's Christian domestics, and the beheading of the bishop Anthimus—was now the scene of a memorable meeting between these two old friends, the occupant of Anthimus's seat and the exiled heresiarch of Alexandria. Eusebius warmly espoused the cause of Arius, as of a man injured by misrepresentation, and wrote "repeatedly" to Alexander, urging him to silence the controversy, and to restore Arius to his position in the Church. Arius himself wrote, in his own name and those of his fellow-exiles, to their "blessed Pope Alexander." In this remarkable letter he appeals to Alexander as having himself taught them to own One God, the Unbegotten Father, who before the ages really begat a Son, whom He caused to subsist by an act of His will, in a condition unchangeable (we observe again that the desperate assertion of the Son's morally changeable nature is withdrawn); this Son not being an emanation from the Father, nor a portion of the Father, nor co-eternal with Him, but, as a created person, wholly the product of the Father's will (a statement often used by the party, who liked to ask whether the Sonship was supposed to be independent of the Father's will, as if to drive their opponents into an absurdity). The writer seems anxious to exclude all materialistic conceptions of the Divine Sonship, and at the same time all notions of the Son's co-equality; the former being strangely assumed to inhere in the doctrine of His being co-essential and co-eternal, from

which the co-equality was inferred by Catholics on the principle which excluded from Christian thought any "greater or less" in Godhead. As in several of the Arian utterances, one sees here the hopeless contradiction into which, for all his logical keenness, Arius fell: he began by insisting that the idea of Sonship should be preserved intact, and he ended, perforce, in a conclusion which virtually destroyed it, by representing the person called "God's only Son" as wholly alien from the essence of His so-called Father, which was the same thing as making Him no Son at all. This nemesis of logic was a point repeatedly urged by St. Athanasius, when he insisted that the doctrine of co-essentiality was the only preservative of the truth of the Divine Sonship—inasmuch as no creature of God could be, in any proper sense, His Son.

But Arius wrote more, at Nicomedia, than this letter to his "Pope." He resolved to popularise his opinions: he wrote "ballads," says his own historian, for "sailors, millers, and travellers;" and he composed a poem which, if not by its very name—"Thalia" (Festivity or Merrymaking)—yet by its metre, that of the infamous poems of the profligate Sotades of Crete (whose verses were offensive, says Neale, to many pagans who "professed no extraordinary purity"), exhibited in a very startling and scandalous manner the author's readiness to ally himself with the secular spirit in one of its most thoroughly pagan forms, and to purchase circulation for his theology by associating it, and the sacred names which it handled and misused, with ideas and recollections from which respectable heathens would shrink back as from a pollution. But the composition itself was quite grave in tone, and its significance was twofold: it illustrated his singular lack of reverential instincts, and thus went far to account for his peculiar heresy; and it further expressed that heresy in its most outspoken and repulsive form. Arius speaks of himself, in the Thalia, as "the far-famed sufferer for God's glory;" and he reiterates his denial of co-equality and co-essential Divinity on the part of the Son of God, who, he says, is "alien in essence from the Father," "has nothing proper to God in His own subsistence," does not fully "know" His Father, but, "as a strong God, praises His Superior," by whose "will He is whatever He is." It was perhaps at this time that he adopted or urged that "Lucianist" theory of the soul of Christ which was afterwards, with a short-sighted ingenuity, adopted and modified in the anti-Arian interest, until it became the symbol of an opposite heresy. Christ, he said,

had no human soul, but His higher nature acted as such; and since that higher nature was after all created, there was no monstrous paradox in assigning to it the emotions belonging in other cases to humanity. The bishop of Nicomedia procured a recognition of Arius from a synod of Bithynian bishops, which put forth a letter of the encyclical kind, urging other prelates to take the same line. One of these letters, addressed to Paulinus of Tyre by Eusebius, is preserved by Theodoret. It gently complains of Paulinus for not having written, like Eusebius of Cæsarea, to Alexander in defence of Arius. "I am sure that if you write to him, you will convince him." The doctrinal language of this letter is remarkable. On the one hand, Eusebius admits what the Arians had ignored at the Council of Alexandria—the Son's "perfect likeness, in power and character (or disposition), to the Father." On the other hand, he maintains the Son to be "entirely distinct from the Father in essence," and treats His "generation" or production as the same in kind with that of men, and even of inanimate creatures. While Eusebius was thus active, an Alexandrian priest named George, who was then staying at Antioch, took upon him to write to Alexander in defence of Arius, and to the Arians in defence of Alexander. To Alexander he wrote, "Do not blame the Arians for saying, 'Once the Son was not:' for Isaiah 'was not,' before he was born to Amoz." To the Arians he suggested that Alexander's phrase, "The Son is from the Father," might bear a very good sense; "for all creatures are in a sense from God" (1 Cor. viii. 6), "and the Son, as a creature, may therefore be said to be from Him." The reply of Alexander to this interference was a sentence of deposition against George, for other offences as well as for heresy; and subsequently we find this man enrolled by Arian influence among the presbyters of Antioch, and thence transferred to the see of Laodicea in Syria. The then bishop of Laodicea, Theodotus, with Patrophilus of Scythopolis, Paulinus, and others, appear to have been induced by Eusebius of Nicomedia to write in behalf of Arius. A namesake of Athanasius, who was bishop of Anazarbus in Cilicia, was particularly outspoken. "The Son of God," he wrote, "is one of the hundred sheep, which in the parable represent all the creatures. If those hundred are all made, and there is nothing beside them save God only, what is there extravagant in the Arians' enumeration of Christ as among the hundred?" And Eusebius of Cæsarea, though not properly an Arian himself, certainly gave practical

countenance to Arius, acted with Arianizers, and afterwards wrote to a bishop named Euphration a letter, in which, as Athanasius tells us, he distinctly said that Christ was not "Very God;" but it is possible that if we had the context, this negation might be intelligible. When, soon afterwards, Arius returned to Palestine, Eusebius was one of three bishops who allowed him to hold services for his adherents, on condition that he sought to be reconciled to Alexander; and this, coupled with the fact that Eusebius's own theological language for the most part admits of an orthodox interpretation, may suggest that what he chiefly cared about was the exclusion of Sabellianism, and that in this, he thought, both Alexander and Arius might come to an understanding.

In the mean time, Alexander himself was bearing the burden of the day with a vigour and heartiness which were perhaps, in some measure, due to the support and aid of his youthful deacon Athanasius, but which secured his reputation among the confessors in the cause of orthodoxy. He and his faithful clergy were constantly accused by Arian intriguers before the civil tribunals, on the evidence of women who had been perverted into heresy. They were scornfully disparaged as unintelligent, and as mere blunderers in theology—as men who talked of "two unbegotten Beings" (a different accusation from that of Sabellianizing, which had been originally brought against them by Arius). The profaneness inherent in Arianism let loose, so to speak, a flood of impieties in Alexandrian society, directed against the doctrine of the co-eternal Sonship: the very theatres resounded with mockeries against Christianity itself, and perhaps the heathen thus early discovered that Arianism would be, so to speak, their natural ally, when they heard Arians ask the boys in the market-place whether there were "one or two Ingenerates," or appeal to women as to "whether a son could exist before he was born." Amid these distressing irreverences, Alexander worked on, writing letter after letter, to the number, says Epiphanius, of seventy—one of them being the famous Encyclical preserved by Socrates. It was written in consequence of the efforts of Eusebius of Nicomedia to obtain friends for Arius by letters to various bishops. After referring to the unity of the Church, as requiring unanimity and sympathy among its members, Alexander speaks of Eusebius of Nicomedia as having formerly exhibited his ill-will (*i.e.* his hostility to the truth), and as now renewing the exhibition of it; he enumerates the Arians of Alexandria who, for maintaining certain heretical

opinions, had been anathematized by a Council of about a hundred Egyptian bishops; he recites those opinions at length; he asks, "Who ever before heard such language?" he argues from the prologue of St. John's Gospel, and other texts, including Heb. xiii. 8, against the notion of a created, a changeable, or a partially ignorant Son of God; he denounces the new heresy as the nearest approach yet made to Antichrist; he expresses regret at the perversion of its upholders; he refers to texts which gave warning of the rise of heresies; and he concludes by exhorting his fellow-bishops not to receive the excommunicated persons, nor to rely on the representations made in their behalf, by Eusebius or by any other. "For it befits us, as Christians, to keep aloof from those who speak or think against Christ:" a maxim which appears again and again in Athanasius's pleadings against this heresy, and shows that he, like his bishop, habitually regarded it as a systematic outrage to the Person of the Redeemer; and loyalty to that Redeemer was the animating and sustaining motion of his lifelong warfare against it. To this letter Alexander procured the signatures of thirty-six priests and forty-four deacons of Alexandria and the Mareotis, who had formerly subscribed the letter of exhortation addressed to the supporters of Arius, and who now—the rather that two priests and four deacons had joined Arianism since the Council of Alexandria—were called upon to testify their assent to the sentence which that Council had pronounced. Socrates, who for some reason or other is prejudiced against Alexander, says that the dissemination of this Encyclical only made matters worse, and embittered Eusebius of Nicomedia, "who at that time was a very powerful person." Another plan was therefore adopted by the indefatigable Alexander: he drew up and circulated, for acceptance among various bishops, a "Tome" or doctrinal formulary. This obtained a large amount of success. It was signed by the bishops of Egypt, including Thebais, and by those of Libya, Pentapolis, Cappadocia, Lycia, Pamphylia, Proconsular Asia, and by some, at least, of those in Syria. And Alexander, on receiving their adhesion, wrote, or perhaps adopted, another circular, which we have as addressed to his namesake, Alexander of Byzantium, and which differs markedly in style from the former, being turgid, involved, and diffuse. In it he complains vehemently of the intrigues and conspiracies, as well as of the heresy, of the Arians; and also of the hasty credence given to them by several bishops, especially three in Syria (meaning Eusebius of Cæsarea, Theodotus,

and Paulinus). He proceeds to argue at great length against the Arian opinions. In his statements there are a few peculiarities of theological expression, such as the use (common to him and Arius) of the word *hypostasis* for subsistence in the sense of "person;" but he carefully excludes the notion that the Son Himself is "unbegotten," while insisting on His co-eternal existence. He employs the term "Theotocos" as a title of the Virgin Mother; it had already been used by Origen, and was afterwards adopted by Athanasius, and became, as all know, the Catholic symbol in the Nestorian controversy. One of the most remarkable passages in this letter is the *caveat*, repeated afterwards by typical Fathers, that no orthodox terms can remove all difficulty, that a full comprehension of God's nature is beyond the reach of our present faculties. The notion of a materialistic partition of the Divine essence is disclaimed, and ascribed to Valentinus and Sabellius, in view of the emanatistic form of Sabellianism; while the Arian theory is traced up to Paul of Samosata, to Artemas, and to "Ebion," the imaginary founder of the Judaical sect which had taken "poverty" as a characteristic. This is a statement which must not be taken rigorously, but as equivalent to saying, "Arius follows in the track of those whose theories have lowered the dignity of the Son of God." The letter concludes by observing that the unanimity of the bishops might serve as a good argument for reclaiming Arians. Among others to whom Alexander wrote, Theodoret names the orthodox Philogonius, bishop of Antioch. The date of the letter to the bishop of Byzantium is apparently later than that of the Encyclical, for it points to a later stage in the history, when many bishops had taken a side; and it may have been written in 323.

Towards the end of this year, Constantine himself interfered in the controversy. He had just triumphed over Licinius, and was naturally annoyed and disturbed by finding the Eastern Christians then at discord with each other. With characteristic impetuosity and self-confidence, he resolved to exhort the disputants to peace; and wrote from Nicomedia a famous letter in which, as Tillemont says, "one may discern, throughout, the mind of the Nicomedian Eusebius." His namesake of Cæsarea has given it at length. It was addressed (with marked disrespect towards the bishop of Alexandria) to "Alexandria and Arius." Constantine begins by dilating on his strong desire to secure religious unity, as a means to civil peace: he adds that he had hoped to heal the African schism of the Donatists by transferring some Eastern bishops to

Africa; he then exclaims against the calamitous outbreak in the East, of a worse dissension than that of Donatism. "Ah, glorious and Divine Providence! what a wound has thus been inflicted on my heart!" And from what an insignificant cause has this new feud arisen! He is informed that Alexander had raised an "idle question," and Arius had expressed an "inconsiderate opinion." He, as their "fellow-servant," would now advise them both to forbear alike such questioning and such answering, as the "mere exercise of an unprofitable idleness," or, at any rate, as quite unfit for public discussions. On a profound subject such as that on which the question was stirred—the nature of God—how few are fit to speak, how few are likely to avoid misapprehension! Let each party, then, excuse the other for what may have given offence. The point at issue does not touch the substance of the Christian "law" or religion: it involves no vital difference; it is "minute," it is "extremely slight," it is "purely verbal," it is "unimportant," it is "quite unessential" (he seems at a loss for words to express his sense of its utter insignificance, of what one might call its purely "academic" character); it does not deserve to become the cause of dissension between grave and earnest men, charged with ministerial responsibilities. They are at one on the essentials of faith: let them take a lesson from the philosophical schools, and agree to differ about petty minutiæ. Such small diversities of sentiment must be expected and provided for: there is an ample extent of common ground, on which all really needful unanimity as to the faith and worship of God can be abundantly secured, to the great comfort, the renewed peace, of Christian society, and to the intense relief of the writer, their "fellow-servant," who will thus regain "days of calm, and nights free from anxiety," and who has put off his journey into the East until this "unreasonable and mischievous dissension" shall be allayed.

Such was the letter of Constantine, which was so highly eulogized, not only by Eusebius, but by Socrates, and has in later times been so often commended as a model of wise and charitable counsel. Writers opposed to what would be called the dogmatic spirit have described its words as "excellent" and "really golden;" and even Jeremy Taylor, while faintly admitting the possibility of Constantine's "undervaluing the question," declares that the letter "tells the truth." It may, however, be considered somewhat strange that those who have thus applauded the Emperor's religious "liberalism" have assumed that he was in a position to know the

actual state of the case. It is, on reflection, evident that he was in no such position; that one who still looked at Christian doctrine, to a great extent, *ab extra*, was simply incompetent to decide whether a theological question were trivial or momentous; that in affecting to decide, he was but showing himself up, so to speak, in the light of a meddler with what he did not, and could not, understand. There might be, of course, a number of questions to which the principle announced by Constantine would apply, but he did not know enough of Christianity to apply the principle aright; and in the case before us, nothing is plainer than that the question whether the Son of God were, or were not, a creature was as vital as any that could be raised by Christian men.

The bearer of the letter was the venerated Hosius, bishop of Cordova, who had been a confessor, under Maximian "Herculeus," the Emperor's father-in-law, and whom the Emperor, Socrates tells us, "greatly loved and honoured." He was charged to examine the case as between Alexander and Arius, and also to inquire "into the conduct of the Meletians and Colluthians," and to do what he could towards promoting uniformity as to the time of observing the Easter festival. He came accordingly to Alexandria, perhaps about the end of 324, or a little earlier, according to Tillemont; but the Council which was held on his arrival was without any important effect, save the distinct declaration of the nullity of the Colluthian ordinations. Colluthus had already submitted to his bishop; and those whom he had pretended to ordain were pronounced mere laymen, on the express ground that their ordainer was not a bishop—a reason which, as we shall see, has a direct bearing on a certain theory in regard to the Alexandrian episcopate. An Egyptian synod in 339 spoke on this point with a positiveness which would have been impossible if at that time the right of presbyters, as such, to ordain had been either asserted or regarded as tenable within the Church. "It is evident, and nobody has any doubt about it, that every imposition of hands on the part of Colluthus has become" (*i.e.* has been pronounced) "invalid, and all who had been appointed by him have taken the position of laymen, and appear as such in the congregation." The dissension caused by Arianism became daily more vehement. Constantine's letters naturally had no effect, and Hosius, on his return, advised the Emperor to try the effect of a general assembly of bishops from all parts of the empire: and he accordingly summoned such a Council to meet at Nicæa, in Bithynia, in the June of 325.

CHAPTER VI.

THE NICENE COUNCIL.—PART I.

We have now reached the close of the first period of the great Arian controversy; and it may be well, in entering upon the second, to bear in mind that six years of agitation and passionate debate had brought out with sufficient clearness the issues which were involved, and the attractions which Arianism could put forward for the consolidation of its forces against the theology which it was attempting to discredit, and the ecclesiastical authorities which it was resolute to defy. Of those attractions, some were calculated to prevail with coarse and irreverent natures, which found a "Thalia" congenial to their taste, or preferred a secularised and unexacting Christianity, or retained a paganised notion of God, or took part, as by instinct, with men against whom synods had pronounced, and whom bishops were treating as heretical. But apart from and beyond such recommendations as these, there can be no doubt that Arianism took strong hold on many serious and thoughtful minds with a living persuasive power, characteristic of the system which exhibited so versatile an energy and so tenacious a vitality, and was destined not only to fight out a long battle with the Church of the fourth century, but to win itself a dominion among barbaric races, and reign over the Spanish Goths until the latter part of the sixth age; to lie dormant, indeed, throughout the mediæval period, but to break forth with a strange renewal of life amid the confusions of the Reformation, to distress Trinitarian Reformers on the Continent, to mould the religious thought of John Milton and Isaac Newton, to plead with English Churchmen through the writings of Samuel Clarke, to be matter of theological debate in the presence of Queen Caroline, to prompt a theory of lax "subscription" which Waterland set himself elaborately to attack, to pervert large sections of British and Irish

Presbyterians, and, according to the testimony of Dr. Dale of Birmingham (in his interesting book on "Christian Doctrine"), to retain adherents in that town "within the memory of" persons still living in 1884. Such a theory, however manifest may be, in our judgment, its inherent flaws and inconsistencies, was sure enough to enlist a large amount of powerful support in the early years of its activity: its notion, for instance, of a secondary divinity might seem to recommend Christianity to minds just emerging out of Polytheism, and those who wanted still to continue on easy terms with the object of their worship might feel more at home with a "deified" creature than with a Word who "was God"—literally, immutably, indefeasibly—while He had become man. Nor is it difficult to enumerate the principal topics which must have been urged by the advocates of the rising heresy, and to which their opponents were not backward to give an answer. For instance: (1) Arians would appeal to not a few minds by adopting a position virtually rationalistic, and by promising to secure a Christianity which should stand clear of philosophical objections; and Catholics would answer by insisting that the truths pertaining to the Divine Nature must be pre-eminently matter of adoring faith, that it was rash to speculate beyond the lines of revelation, and that the Arian position was itself open to criticism from reason's own point of view. (2) Arians would call upon Catholics to "be logical," to admit the prior existence of the Father as involved in the very primary notion of fatherhood; to halt no more between a premiss and a conclusion, to exchange their sentimental pietism for grave convictions sustainable by argument. And Catholics would bid them, in turn, remember the inevitably limited scope of human logic in regard to things divine; would point out the sublime uniqueness of the Divine relation called Fatherhood; would proceed to carry the war into the enemy's country by dwelling on the suicidal force of that Arian dialectic which tended, in fact, to annihilate its own ground by practically denying the essential Sonship, and on the impossibility of the Arian conception of a created and secondary god—a "demi-god," in Professor Gwatkin's phrase—a being who could be decked out with an honorary divinity, while he was essentially the mere product of the one all-creating Will, and therefore—to take the point by which the Roman Catholic Dr. Hawarden put Dr. Clarke to silence—held His existence precariously *durante beneplacito* of the Father. (3) Arians would

contend that they alone did justice to Monotheism, by representing the Father as the one solitary, peerless, incomparable Eternal; and Catholics would bid them either give up their adoration of the so-called "Son," whom they proclaimed to be "alien from the Father's essence," or else consider how to clear themselves from the stain of gross Ditheistic impiety. (4) Arians would endeavour to load the Catholic conception of an essentially Divine Sonship with the imputation of a materialistic degradation of the Divine nature; and Catholics would earnestly disclaim all carnal Gnostic dreams of "partition" or "severance" in God. (5) Arians would invoke the Christian sentiment of the time as against a disguised return to Sabellianism, involved in the recognition of Filial Co-equality; and Catholics would point out the radical difference between such an idea and the merging of the Son's personality in the Father's, which was the characteristic doctrine of Sabellianism alike in its earlier and its later forms. (6) Arians would claim as their own stronghold certain passages of Scripture, especially "My Father is greater than I;" and Catholics would explain these as entirely consistent with the Son's essential co-equality, and as referring, in part, to His acknowledged derivation of being from the Father *as* Father, in part to His assumption of a created nature for man's sake; and having so explained them, would urge the irreconcilable contradiction between a theory which made His Divinity but nominal, and a series of texts which attested its reality. (7) Once more, Arians would profess to be but repeating, or legitimately developing, the strong "Subordinationist" language of some earlier Church writers; and Catholics would, in the first instance, meet this allegation by showing how such writers, fairly construed, differed from Arianism, or even furnished evidence against it, and would then broadly denounce the new heresy as a denial of the immemorial traditionary faith, and as, in fact, a reproduction, in a new form, of what a writer early in the third century had called the "God-denying apostasy," and of the Jewish antipathy to a Christ who was "God's own Son."

We have now seen what were, so to speak, the remoter and the immediate antecedents of the controversy, what were the circumstances in which it actually broke out, what were the essential propositions of the Arian theory, and what the attractions which it could offer to various minds. And we can have no difficulty in apprehending the issues which it raised. Of these the first was, as has been well said, essentially "spiritual, devotional, and therein

moral." Who and what was Jesus Christ? Was He to be adored, or was He not? Were Christians right or wrong in making Him the object of prayer and praise, and also of a trust, a loyalty, an obedience, a devotion, literally supreme, unqualified, and absolute? He had from the first been so regarded: "the essence of Christian life," as Dr. Wace has excellently said, had been this devotion without limit, this self-surrender without reserve. But if he was personally a creature, however exalted, however super-angelic, then he had, *as* a creature, no claim to this manifold and all-comprehending *worship;* and Christians must lose no time in retracing their steps to a standing-ground which would, at any rate, keep them clear of idolatry. And then if Arians rejoined, "We *do* worship Him," the answer was obvious: "On your own showing, you have no right to do so. You are idolaters, not in fact, but in principle. You are transgressing the essential requirements of Monotheism, and relapsing virtually into polytheistic laxities. Your so-called 'Son of God' is 'a being who is not to be supposed, a theological monster, unlawfully, profanely, and falsely imagined'" (to adopt the telling phrase of Dr. Mozley). And thus it was the task of the Catholics to uphold the Christian idea of God in its full practical import, as severely excluding all secondary worship, under whatever Christian terms its heathenishness might be disguised. Yet again, if Christ were not truly God, if he were God in a merely titular sense, as it were *honoris causâ*, and separated in the root of his being by an infinite chasm from the Divine essence and life, then he could not be an adequate expression and revelation of God, could not "interpret" Him accurately; and Christians must give up the inspiring assurance of being brought very near to the Father through the Son, of beholding in Him "a glory as of the Only-begotten," the very "glory of God in the face of Jesus." The Most High would be for them, as for the old Gnostics, the Most Distant—an abstract and practically unknowable "Depth," instead of a God who had "*so* loved the world," and who could be "seen" by those who saw Christ, and in Him knew "Him that was true." Here then was another aspect of the Arian movement, which exhibited it as distinctly retrograde. And once more, it might be felt by thoughtful observers of the Christian type of character that the power of Christ's ethical teaching was closely bound up with the divine supremacy of His claim; and therefore a theory which explained away His Godhead would mean the weakening of Christian

motives and the moral impoverishment of Christian life. As Dr. Dale has well said, the doctrine asserted against Arianism was "only a definite protest against forms of thought which, by denying to the Lord Jesus Christ His divine glory, would have paralyzed the characteristic power of His ethical teaching;" or, in Dr. Wace's words, the absolute "moral unity" between the will of Jesus, as represented in the Gospels, and the will of God, being such as no mere man could exhibit, is a "moral foundation" of the doctrine of Their unity of nature. Thus, on all sides, the faith was imperilled by the growth of a theory which in effect assailed its vitality and its power as a religion; and it is of this that Carlyle must have been thinking when he made the memorable remark, that "if Arianism had won, Christianity would have dwindled into a legend."

So stood the two parties face to face, when Constantine's messengers were hurrying to all quarters of the empire, to summon the spiritual rulers of Christendom to the great assembly which he had resolved to hold at Nicæa. The notion of such a council would be readily caught up by Constantine, as congenial to his own magnificent ideas of imperial unity—ideas which he would be glad to clothe with a religious and ecclesiastical form; not less, moreover, as likely to furnish the only effectual means for restoring that internal peace and good order of the Church, which this wearying and exasperating controversy had broken up, as a civil war might break up the quiet of the empire. And as he threw himself heartily into the plan, so was he, the Emperor, alone competent to carry it out. There is no doubt that this First Œcumenical Council could only, humanly speaking, have been "gathered together by the commandment and will" of the first Christian "Princeps." No other authority, in those days, was sufficient to assemble such a body as the Nicene Council—meeting, not like the old councils of Antioch, as a simple representative of a large part of the recently legalised Christian Church, but as the gathering together, under solemn public sanctions, of that whole Church as co-extensive with the empire, and as avowedly possessing the sympathy and respect—in a word, the practical adhesion—of him in whom the empire was, on "Cæsarean" principles, gathered up and impersonated. To understand the position, we must transplant our thoughts into a "Cæsarean" atmosphere, such as that which prevailed throughout the period of the Great Councils, and was to a large extent

reproduced under the monarchy of a "Carolus Magnus" and a "Ludovicus Pius." Constantine regarded himself as, in his own daring phrase—his unbaptized character being considered—"a bishop for the external relations of the Church," just as later sovereigns, who were actually members of the Church, and thus had better right to take its affairs in hand, might be called its *advocati*, its guardians—in some sense its "supreme governors." And in the discharge of this peculiar "episcopate," although, no doubt, with the cordial assent and approval of the leading prelates (a condition obviously indispensable, and one which he himself would never have dreamed of neglecting), Constantine sent forth his letters of invitation or citation, informing the bishops of the time and place of the intended meeting, and placing at their disposal public conveyances, or relays of horses, as had been the case in regard to the Council of Arles. It may be thought that one of these documents is extant, in what purports to be the Syriac version of an epistle of Constantine desiring certain bishops to come to Nicæa, partly on the ground that the Council of Ancyra "formerly consented that it should be so." The language is not free from suspicion, for it might seem as if the writer of this letter did not know that the Council of Ancyra had been held eleven years before the Nicene, but only knew of it as more ancient than the Nicene. However, supposing it to be genuine, Constantine must be referring to some other meeting of bishops at Ancyra, the record of which is lost, but which may perhaps have been a sort of preliminary synod, in which Alexander and Hosius came to a full understanding.

The letter in question gives, at any rate, one probable reason for the selection of Nicæa—the excellence of its climate. In the vivid words of Cardinal Newman, the "beautiful town lay on an eminence in the midst of a well-wooded, flower-embellished country, with the clear bright waters of the Ascanian lake" at its foot, and successive tiers of mountains behind. There was something also which pleased Constantine's fancy in the significance of its name as the "City of Victory," for he loved to style himself "Constantine the Victorious;" and it was, if not the first, yet certainly the second city in Bithynia, and could trace its foundation to Antigonus and Lysimachus. Here, then, in the early part of June, 325, assembled a large number of bishops; but when we attempt to ascertain the exact number, we are involved in the uncertainties which, for want of precise and careful

records, much altered many of the proceedings of the Council of Nicæa.

There are extant several lists of bishops who subscribed the acts of the Council; but they do not agree in their numbers, and they are clearly not exhaustive. Thus, the first of the five lists printed by Mr. C. H. Turner gives 218 names; the second, 210; the third, 223; the fourth, 221; the fifth, 195 (this last professes to omit "the Westerns, who were not suspected of heresy"); and these lists include 15, 14, or 12 "chorepiscopi" who evidently represented absent diocesan bishops. A fragment of a Coptic list stops short at Pamphylia, having thus far exhibited only 147 names, but with a number of blank spaces; and a Syriac list gives 220, reckoning the two presbyter-legates of Rome as two bishops (which, of course, is incorrect, for they represented the single person of their own bishop, Silvester), and mentioning a few of the Westerns. Two Latin lists given by Mansi in his "Concilia" give only 227 and 204 names, including 15 and 13 chorepiscopi. Once more, the Greek list of Theodore the Reader exhibits only 212 names; but the compiler adds that he has not been able to learn the remainder. If we ask information of historians or other writers of the time, Constantine's own letter to the Alexandrians speaks of "more than 300 bishops;" Eustathius of Antioch, as appears from Theodoret, told his people soon afterwards that there were about 270, but added that he had not taken any pains to ascertain the precise number. Eusebius, in his Life of Constantine, speaks of "more than 250." Athanasius, writing soon after A.D. 350, gives the number as more than 300; in a later work, he fixes it at 318, the famous number afterwards generally accepted. Julius of Rome speaks of "the 300;" Hilary in one passage speaks of "300 or more," in others of 318; Epiphanius, writing fifty years after the Council, says that "the Emperor assembled an Œcumenical Synod of 318 bishops, whose names are preserved to the present day;" St. Gregory Nazianzen gives the same number. St. Ambrose, writing in 377, found a mystic significance in the number 318—the famous symbolic appropriateness, as it struck many minds among the orthodox, of the number of Abraham's victorious servants, and of the numerical value of the T (the cross), and IH (Jesus). Sozomen speaks of "about 320," evidently with 318 in his mind; and Theodoret gives the latter number. This account prevailed in the Eastern Church, and also in the Western; and the Fathers of Nicæa became known as "the 318." They

were attended, says Eusebius, by an "innumerable host" of presbyters, deacons, and acolyths, but these—among whom Athanasius was pre-eminent—must be distinguished from the actual members of the Synod. It was composed, properly speaking, of the prelates alone; but they were fully qualified by their antecedents to represent their dioceses, and had provided themselves with clerical attendance such as might be at once a means of counsel or information and a check on inconsiderate action.

The assemblage of bishops and other ecclesiastics represented at once the manifoldness and the unity of the Church universal. Eusebius calls it, in his rhetorical vein, "a great garland of beautiful flowers of every hue." There were all conceivable diversities of age and experience: some of those who met face to face at Nicæa were eminent, says Eusebius, "for wisdom of speech, others for gravity of life and patient fortitude; some were honoured for their length of years, others were in the ardour of youthful energy; some had but just entered on their ministrations." There were still more striking differences of nation and country; there might be seen, in close contact, faces from Syria, Cilicia, Phœnicia, Arabia, Palestine, Egypt, Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Pamphylia, Thrace, Macedonia, Greece, Western Europe, and countries lying outside the limits of the empire. Alexander of Alexandria, who of all men present must have felt most keenly the intensity of the crisis, was attended by fourteen suffragans from Egypt and the Thebaid, and five from the two provinces of Libya. One of these bishops was Potammon of Heracles, who had lost an eye in Maximin's persecution; another confessor was Paphnutius from the Thebaid, whose name is not given in the lists; a few were already committed to Arianism, including the deposed Secundus of Ptolemais. But the most interesting person in the whole group that surrounded the "Pope" of Alexandria was a young man of puny stature, but with a face of singular beauty and animation: he was the "archdeacon" Athanasius. Among the prelates of Syria and Palestine was Eustathius, the orthodox successor of the orthodox Philogonius of Antioch, and destined to suffer from Arian malignity; Eusebius the historian, from Cæsarea, already well known to Alexander as, at least in part, a sympathiser with Arius; Paulinus of Tyre, and Patrophilus of Scythopolis, who took the same line; Macarius of Jerusalem, who had maintained the doctrinal purity of his apostolic bishopric. From Neocæsarea on the Euphrates came Paul, whose hands had been paralyzed with

red-hot iron under the recent persecution of Licinius. With him were James of Nisibis, the great saint of Mesopotamia, who was to win himself renown in the resistance of his city to the Persians; Aitallaha, the new bishop of the "blessed city" of Edessa, where the Church had flourished from at least the early part of the second century; Aristaces (properly Arisdaghes), from the Greater Armenia, the son of Gregory "the Illuminator," who had organized the Armenian national Church; and John "of Persia," sole representative of a Church which traced up its original foundation to sub-apostolic missionaries, and was ere long to pass through the fiery trial of the long persecution of Sapor.

From Cæsarea in Cappadocia came Leontius, remarkable as the consecrator, in former years, according to one account, of Gregory the Illuminator, and ranked by Athanasius among bishops faithful to the truth; he had just baptized another Gregory, the father of Gregory Nazianzen. From Gangra came Hypatius, who was said to have been afterwards murdered by Novatians. The prelates of the immediate neighbourhood—as Theognis of Nicæa, Eusebius of Nicomedia, Maris of Chalcedon, Menophantus of Ephesus—would look with unfriendly eyes at the majority of stranger bishops; for their sympathies were with Arius, and their hope, doubtless, was that the Council might be somehow prevented from siding, as they would say, with the intolerant Pope of Alexandria. On the other hand, Marcellus of Ancyra would be known as one of the most determined supporters of Alexander; he was afterwards to be known as one commonly accused of having taken up the opposite extreme to Arianism, and justified, thus far, the Arian taunt that to denounce Arianism was, in effect, to Sabellianize. Spyridion of Tremithus in Cyprus, famous for his quaint and hearty simplicity, would be pointed out as one who had still retained the habits of his former shepherd-life, after he was appointed a pastor of men.

Turning westward, so to speak, we may picture the arrivals of Alexander of Byzantium, Pœderos of Heraclea, Pistus of Athens, Alexander of Thessalonica—a venerable man held in high esteem—Protogenes of Sardica, and one who was to the northern frontiers of the empire what John the Persian was to the eastern,—Theophilus, "bishop of the Goths," who in after-days was succeeded by the Arian Ulfilas. From Sicily came Capito; from Calabria, Marcus; from Northern Italy, Eustorgius of Milan; from Rome itself, not the aged Silvester in person, but two presbyters as his

deputies, Vito and Vincentius. Gaul sent a representative in the person of Nicasius, who is called bishop of "Divio," which Duchesne identifies with Die in Dauphiny. Domnus of Stridon represented Pannonia; and from the utmost west, beside "the great Hosius," appeared one who had already had his full share in ecclesiastical troubles of a different kind, Cæcilian of Carthage. Among the bishops of cities were to be seen some prelates of a lower rank; for one of the lists gives us the names of fifteen Chorepiscopi, or, as we might say, bishops suffragan in rural districts. And Constantine had invited a bishop who was actually in schism, the Novatian Acesius, of Byzantium, much respected for his sanctity.

If we endeavour to estimate the amount of Arianizing disposition which was to be found among the bishops, it would seem that about twenty prelates were more or less favourable to the heresy. Some of these have been already mentioned. Theodoret says that there were but a few of this class, and compares them to sunken rocks, because they were reserved in expressing their opinion. We shall presently see with what peculiar diplomacy some of them laboured to preserve that opinion from censure—to retain it for a *locus standi* in the Church.

The exact day on which the Council began its work has been not a little disputed; but on the whole the preponderance of authority would lead us to think that, even if, according to a possible interpretation of a statement ascribed to Atticus, *de facto* bishop of Constantinople in A.D. 406, the opening was at first fixed for the 14th of June, yet for some reason the actual opening took place on the 19th, the day mentioned in the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon, and by other authorities of great weight. It is to be observed that the Emperor was not present; he probably did not arrive at Nicæa until after July 3, the anniversary of his victory over Licinius; and to speak of his having really opened the Council is to give an incorrect account of the facts. In his absence, its first sittings were held more or less informally. A question has been raised as to who was president: the bishop of Cordova, "the great Hosius," is called by Athanasius the "head of all the Councils," and his name comes first in the extant lists of signatures, being always followed by the names of Vincent and Vito, Silvester's presbyter-legates; and if some authorities are quoted for the presidency of Eustathius of Antioch, the evidence preponderates for Constantine's ecclesiastical adviser. But when

Gelasius of Cyzicus, the historian of the Council, a writer by no means of first-rate authority, speaks of Hosius as "holding the place of Silvester, the bishop of great Rome, *with* Vito and Vincent, presbyters of Rome," he is simply inserting that statement into the text of Eusebius, whose account he is quoting; and the insertion is an "evident corruption" of that text, and is accompanied by a further perversion of its meaning; for whereas Eusebius wrote, "But the prelate of the imperial city (Rome) was absent through old age, while presbyters of his were present and filled his place," Gelasius actually transfers this remark to the case of Byzantium; "of the *now* imperial city, Metrophanes the prelate was absent through old age, while presbyters of his," etc. The ancient authorities which Gelasius ought to have had before him distinguish Hosius markedly, as signing for himself, from the two presbyters who "subscribed for their bishop, Silvester," who "were present to supply his place;" or as a Coptic version has it, "Hosius said, 'I believe as is above written;' and Vito and Innocentius (*sic*), presbyters, 'We sign for our bishop, who is the bishop of Rome: he believes as is above written.'" Thus, we may conclude that while it is most likely that Hosius presided, it is certain that he did not, like the two priests from Rome, hold a formal commission to represent Silvester, although he may not improbably have been chosen to preside, partly on account of his personal eminence, and partly as knowing the mind of the Roman bishop, as well as of their common sovereign. At all events, this is the only sense in which we can, with any reason or likelihood, be considered as at all representing Silvester; and such a sense would not justify us in calling him the "legate of Rome." In short, as Silvester had not, so far as we know, any peculiar share in the preparation for the synod, neither did he hold by deputies the primary place in its proceedings; and this twofold fact is peculiarly momentous as against the Roman assertion of an original and continuous supremacy and infallibility, acknowledged on all sides to be inherent in the Roman bishop. For if ever there was a time for an infallible Pope to speak, it was in this first conflict with Arianism. But nobody asked Silvester thus to speak, and he never attempted to do so. In other words, neither he nor any one else believed in papal infallibility.

The place of the meeting was, in the first instance, what Eusebius calls "a house of prayer," the great church of the city, which Theognis would be morally obliged to place, with whatever

reluctance, at the disposal of the Council, and of which we are told that the Turkish conqueror Orchan in the fourteenth century turned it into a mosque, and substituted for its Christian mosaics the symbol of Islam. Within this sacred place the great question of Arianism was at once brought under discussion. The Council, although, properly speaking, composed purely of bishops, did not deliberate with closed doors. Before the whole number of bishops had arrived, and therefore before the actual assembling of the Council, a preliminary discipline was carried on with what may strike us as a strange freedom: for laymen, "skilled in dialectic," were permitted to take part in the argument, on the orthodox and on the Arian side; and not laymen only, but, as Sozomen informs us, even pagan professors of philosophy, animated either by an honest wish for information as to Christian belief, or by a desire to discredit Christianity by reducing the doctrinal question to a logomachy, urged their questions or their objections on the consideration of an assembly which, by its unparalleled character, offered them such a field for Greek disputation as Hellenism had never enjoyed before that day. Then it was, according to a touching story, that on the day before the Council met, one of these philosophers, indulging in railleries against the Christian religion and the bishops, was interrupted by a simple-minded confessor—by one account a layman, by another a rustic bishop—who, with all the external disadvantages which bodily mutilation could entail, came forward, regardless of taunt and laughter, amid a group outside the church-gates, and exclaimed, "In the Name of Jesus Christ, O philosopher, listen!" and then proceeded to state plainly the leading points of the faith, with a power which instantly commanded the philosopher's submission. "I believe," he answered; and afterwards assured his friends that "an inexplicable force had swayed his soul to embrace Christianity."

This anecdote, interesting in itself, is valuable as illustrating the extent to which a simple tenacity of traditional belief prevailed among those who were assembled at Nicæa. A considerable number of the "Three Hundred"—as we may call them for convenience—were, in truth, to adopt the phrase which Sabinus, a heretical bishop of later times, applied to the whole body, "simple and unlearned men," who were bent on adhering to the "canon" or standard of faith, but felt themselves not at home in controversy, and therefore were disposed to cut short the

discussion, and protest against a hearing being given to heterodox argument. And when Arius was called in, and avowed his opinions with a boldness which scorned evasion, we are told that several bishops stopped their ears, and cried out that such blasphemies merited instant condemnation. These were they who, as Sozomen expresses it, were "led by the simplicity of their character to accept the faith as to the Deity without curious speculations: but," he adds, "others insisted that it was not right to follow the more ancient opinions without testing them." Now, even if these last words could be referred to the small but definitely Arian section, and to the "Eusebians" whose aim was to conceal the issue raised under terms of smooth vagueness, there is no necessity, and indeed no reason, for supposing that the sentiment was not, in a true sense, adopted by several of the orthodox. There would be among the latter some, perhaps a considerable number, who were as firmly persuaded as their simpler brethren of the duty of "holding fast the form of sound words," of "contending for the faith once delivered," of not departing from the "canon" of orthodoxy, of cleaving to "the teaching of the Fathers:" they felt, and could express, the power of the question, "Who ever heard such things as these?" they knew that their feet were on a rock while they resisted all novelties in doctrine; but they also knew that, when a great controversy had absorbed the interest of all thoughtful minds in Christendom, it was impossible to suppress it by mere anathemas; that it was rather a call on the instructed believer not merely to witness for his belief, but to argue for it—to point out its deep and broad foundations, to exhibit its "proportion, symmetry, grandeur, simplicity, interior congruity," and to show that no other belief was Christianity in its fulness, and therefore that it alone had a divine right to the allegiance of men, and a divine efficacy to satisfy their spiritual needs and renew their inner life. This would have also a bearing on another class, those who had to be convinced that some new departure in point of language had to be taken in view of a new emergency—that to leave the question open, and trust that the evil would right itself without being met fairly in front, would be at once short-sighted and unfaithful. Such was the twofold task laid upon orthodox theologians by the distresses and scandals of the Arian controversy; and the young Alexandrian deacon, who was already making his presence felt in the assemblage of prelates, was unconsciously teaching his elders

more than they had yet realised of the greatness and urgency of the duty of the day.

But these preliminary discussions, for so we must regard them, showed that the Council was but learning its work, and was not, at first, ripe for a systematic and methodical consideration of the question. We cannot wonder that some time was, as we might think, wasted in desultory conversations, and that the excitable temperaments of a large number of men brought together for an unfamiliar duty, in circumstances which tended to bring out all differences of tone, should have in some instances run into angry personalities, alien to the awful subject on which they were engaged; insomuch that a variety of papers of accusation, or complaint, on the part of bishop against bishop, were prepared for presentation to the Emperor on his arrival.

That arrival took place, it is commonly said, after the 3rd of July, on which day Constantine kept the anniversary of his victory at Hadrianople. He then came from Nicomedia to Nicæa: his first act was to receive the papers of accusation, to form them into one packet, to read through it, and to lay it aside. The next day was fixed for a solemn sitting of the Council, with a view to arriving at a decision on the Arian case. The bishops assembled, not in the church, but in the largest hall of the palace of Nicæa, which is said to have stood close to the shore of the Ascanian lake: the spot is still marked by "a few broken columns." All along the sides of the apartment were seats arranged for the bishops. "The whole Council seated itself with becoming order:" there was a hush of expectation; then came in, one after another, some of the Christian courtiers, and at last a signal was given to announce the approach of the Emperor himself. He entered: the bishops rose to greet him, and gazed with an indescribable thrill of emotion on the entrance of the Augustus into a Christian Synod. The tall commanding figure, which had lost none of its stateliness through advancing years (his age was now fifty-one), the purple (or dark-red) robe, the diadem, and the jewels, were less impressive, after all, than the downcast eyes, the "faltering steps," the blush of diffidence, the standing posture which, when he reached his place, he assumed until the bishops motioned to him to take his seat on a small gilded chair provided for him. He sat down, and all did the like. Then, says Eusebius, one of the bishops, he who occupied the first place on the Emperor's right hand, arose, and in a short speech addressed the

Emperor, and gave thanks to God on his behalf. This, perhaps, implies that Eusebius himself was the speaker; and so Sozomen understood it. True, Theodoret says that it was Eustathius of Antioch who "crowned the Emperor's head with a garland of eulogy, and thanked him for the interest which he had taken in religious affairs." But probably Eustathius only made a short speech, and Eusebius followed with a formal oration in the pompous style which suited his notions of eloquence. Constantine then broke the silence which followed by a Latin speech, delivered in soft and gentle tones, after a bright and kindly glance round the assembly, and a few moments spent in collecting his thoughts. "It was," he began, "the sum of my wishes to find myself in your midst, and I owe thanks to the Sovereign of the universe that this my desire has been attained." With much dexterity and grace, he proceeded to speak of their "unanimity," and then intimated a hope that it would be perfected and secured. He spoke of himself as their "fellow-servant," as "deeply pained whenever the Church of God was in dissension, a worse evil, to his mind, than any war:" he stated the reasons for convoking the Council; and exhorted them all to labour, without further delay, for the establishment of religious concord, and to put aside for this great object all personal irritation or unfriendliness. Probably it was after this address that he produced from within his robes the packet of accusations, and, with a remark on the Christian duty of forgiveness, caused it to be burnt in presence of them all.

And now the great debate began in earnest. We have but fragmentary and imperfect records of its course, but it would seem that Arius was again called before the Council, and again avowed his sentiments with an energy which expressed itself in passionate emotion, and impressed Constantine very unfavourably, as we may infer from a satirical letter clearly subsequent to the Council. His outspoken frankness (to be remembered to his credit) was an embarrassment to Eusebius of Nicomedia, who, in conjunction with others, called after him "Eusebians," strove to neutralise its effect. He exerted himself privately to obtain Constantine's support. "The Emperor," says Eusebius of Cæsarea, with an obvious touch of exaggeration, "listened patiently to all, and took time to weigh the arguments advanced. He gave support, in part, to both sides. . . . Employing his power of speaking Greek, he was very mild and suave in persuading some and convincing others; and, drawing all into

unanimity, he made them agree in one sentiment as to the points at issue," endeavouring to act as mediator between opponent speakers, and urging mutual conciliation and forbearance with an emphasis which would have come better from one whose position was inside the Church and not outside. The plan of the Eusebians was to refrain from language which would seriously offend the majority; but they did not, perhaps could not, consistently adhere to it. The majority of the bishops, doubtless guided by the genius and insight of the Alexandrian deacon—who in his management of the debate, "gained the applause of all the orthodox, and incurred the enmity of all their adversaries"—were not, at this moment, impatient to push matters to extremity; they rather desired to draw out the thoughts of the Eusebians, and, if possible, to find in their language, when carefully considered, materials for a good understanding. Thus, they either themselves proposed, or, at any rate, accepted the proposal, that the faith should be summarised in strictly Biblical terms; for instance, that the Son should be declared to be "from God." The minority conferred with each other, and agreed to accept this phrase; "for," said they, "it is written, 'All things are from God.'" A pitiful evasion, which must have gone far to destroy all hope of unity! The Catholics proceeded: "Will you own the Son to be the true Power and Image of the Father, like to Him in all things, His eternal Image, undivided from Him, and unalterable?" Athanasius, with his keen eyes, saw the little knot of "Eusebians," as he says, "whispering to each other, and winking with their eyes," to secure the adoption of this language also, as capable of a sense which they could accept. "Yes, let us agree; *for* it is written, 'Man is the image of God,' 'we are in Him,' 'nothing shall separate us from His love;'" and then, anticipating or adopting a quibble employed by the Arian "sophist" Asterius, they added, "He may well be the Power of the Father, for the people of Israel are the power (or host) of the Lord, and even the caterpillar and the locust are so called: this title, therefore, is harmless." "Will you own," once more they were asked, "that the Son is Very God?" "We have no objection to do so; if He has been so made, verily so He is." It was perhaps at this point that Eusebius of Nicomedia, according to a statement made by St. Ambrose, was rash enough to produce a paper expressing his objection to the description of the Lord as the true and uncreated Son of God. "If we say this, it will mean that He is of one essence with the Father;" evidently intending this as a

reductio ad absurdum. Indignant at this language, the great body of the Council ordered the document to be torn to pieces; and it is apparently to this that Athanasius refers when he says that the words employed by the Eusebians were condemned by the Council—a phrase which suits well with Eustathius's description of the Eusebian document, as offensive from its "perversity," *i.e.* its utter deviation from the lines of truth.

What was to be done? The honest and considerate attempt to find a ground of union in New Testament language—an endeavour in which Athanasius, habitually ready, as Keble says, "to commit his cause to the witness of Scripture, and to follow the voice of Scripture wherever it should lead him," could join with all sincerity, even although he might be doubtful of its success—had been baffled by the versatility of heretical equivocation. A disingenuous use of terms, a readiness to "palter in a double sense," traceable probably to the habits of Greek disputation, was characteristic of the Arians, as afterwards of Pelagians and Paulicians, and other sects; and on the present occasion it became clear that, as the language of the sacred books in regard to the Divine Sonship could be robbed of its force by Arian evasiveness, it was necessary, in the interests of the Scriptural truth itself, to go beyond the field of Scriptural phraseology. Persuaded of the fact which St. Augustine, some eighty years later, urged on an Arian layman of high position, that even if a particular term were absent from Scripture, "the thing intended by it might be found there,"—the fact, let us add, pithily expressed by Waterland as against modern Arians, that "if we preserve the true sense of Scripture, and upon that sense build our faith, we then build upon Scripture only, for the sense of Scripture *is* Scripture," although it be clothed in phrases of later date,—the leading Fathers of Nicæa resolved to guard the true meaning of their Scriptural statements by the help of some words taken, so to speak, from outside. This experience naturally turned the bishops' attention to the forms of catechetical teaching and baptismal confession current in the great typical Churches, and representing so many lines of tradition from the apostolic or sub-apostolic periods. It may be that some of these forms were recited by their respective bishops, by way of pointing out landmarks for the guidance of the Council. Such a course would be most natural in itself, for the assembling of the Council gave an opportunity, which had never occurred before, for a comparison of these forms of the common faith—for a confluence, so to speak, of these

kindred streams of tradition; and Alexander had already, in one of his letters, set forth in substance his own baptismal creed. And as this course would then commend itself to the leaders of the Council, so it seems to illustrate and account for the proceeding of Eusebius of Cæsarea, who presented, for public reading in the Council, the Creed of his own church, and which he prefaced by these words: "As we received from the bishops who preceded us, and in our first catechizing, and when we received the 'laver,' and as we have learned from the divine Scriptures, and as in our presbyterate, and in our episcopate itself, we believed and taught; so now believing, we exhibit to you our belief, and it is this." The creed which followed bears a considerable resemblance to that which the Council ultimately framed; it was emphatic on the personal distinctions in the Holy Trinity, asserting each Person to be and to exist "as truly Father, Son, and Holy Spirit;" it recognised "one Lord Jesus Christ" as "the Word of God, God from God, Light from Light, Life from Life, Only-begotten Son, firstborn of all creation, begotten before all ages, and through whom all things came into being;" and it mentioned also His becoming Incarnate for our salvation, His life among men, His Passion, Resurrection on the third day, Ascension to the Father, and future coming in glory to judge (the) living and dead," and concluded, as then quoted, with "We believe also in one Holy Spirit;" yet it was not sufficiently explicit as to the main point then at stake, His eternal relation to the Father. There could not be any positive objection to this formulary; and we may believe Eusebius when he tells us—in his letter to his own "Cæsareans"—that no one "contradicted" it, and that the Emperor was "foremost" in expressing his approval. But it was practically inadequate for the emergency, for it could be misused by Arian facility in glossing; and of this the orthodox majority became convinced, although they were genuinely desirous to make it, if possible, a basis for union between themselves and those who were not absolutely committed to downright Arianism. Something must be added to it: to begin with, an antithetical phrase which affirmed the Son to have been "begotten, not made," would distinctly exclude the fundamental Arian negation of the Son's uncreatedness. The creed of Jerusalem might be laid under contribution for the phrase "true God," which after all would but apply that title to the Son in accordance with one interpretation of 1 John v. 20. But a further step seemed requisite—the adoption of one or two phrases which might be called technical. And

here, before going into any details on this point, we must notice the charge, frequently brought against the Nicenes, of "gratuitously and pedantically abandoning the beautiful simplicity of primitive Christian thought, and troubling the clear stream of Christian language by the infusion of a foreign element of Hellenic speculation." Now first, this raises a question which can surely receive a "simple" answer: Will the "simple child-language" of those who listened to apostles and learned to pray in the name of Jesus, and to expect help and blessing from Him, be sure to suffice for the needs of a Church which has grown alike in extension and thought under the training of two eventful centuries? The "clock-hands" cannot be thus put backward. The Church had come out into the open, had been obliged to construct a theological position against the tremendous attacks of Gnosticism, and to provide for educated inquirers in great centres of Greek learning. She had become conscious of her debt to "the wise;" she saw that in a true sense she must "put away childish things," and "build up according to the need" of the actual time. That meant what Canon Scott Holland has described as the action of faith in "putting its intellectual power to use, considering itself, taking its own measure, formulating its own meaning." And then, if Churchmen were to apply anything like an intellectual treatment to the great religious question before them, they must make use, to some extent, of the current terms of their own day—must behave, as it has been well said, "like Greek-speaking men of education;" even as St. Paul had adopted *morphê* and *pleroma* as terms with a technical import—as St. John had infused a richer and worthier significance into the *Logos* of a Palestinian or of an Alexandrian school of thought, and as *hypostasis* had been used of the Divine being in Heb. i. 3, and *physis* in 2 Pet. i. 4. But next, not to say that the Nicenes had wished at first to dispense with all terms that might be deemed technical, as if, in Newman's phrase, they were "loth" to believe that the time had come for a new departure in this respect, it is certain that they did not commit themselves to any meaning which Greek schools might attach to the words which they adopted, but explained the sense in which, for their parts, they employed them. The word *ousia* was the main term thus adopted. But then arose a new difficulty. It had acquired two philosophical senses widely different, and, as we shall see presently, might be suggestive of theological senses both orthodox and heterodox. In Aristotelian use, it had meant, primarily and

properly, the individual, the unit; and secondarily the class, or the general characteristics, the "nature" common to various particular things as members of that class, as Aristotle calls the classes in which the *ousiai* in the proper sense exist by the name of "second *ousiai*." But later thought had reversed this order, making the universal or general sense primary, and the individual sense secondary; and this was the usage then most prevalent, partly, perhaps, under the influence of Neo-Platonism. Again, as *ousia* was originally descriptive of a man's property or goods—as we find it used in the Parable of the Prodigal—so, in the materialising system of the Stoics, it became a synonym for matter. But when Christian writers had introduced it into theology, and spoken of the *ousia* of God, they generally meant by it His essence, His own nature, His very being, which, *as* His, was incommunicable and unique; at the same time, it was sometimes used for that being viewed on the side of what we call personality. It was in the former of these two cognate Christian senses that the word had been brought forward during the Arian controversy: the original Arians declared, when examined by the Council of Alexandria, that they believed the Son to be not like to the Father as to "essence," and to be alien from the "essence" of the Father; and Eusebius of Nicomedia, writing to Paulinus, distinctly said that the Son was *not* "from the essence of the Father." In other words, he denied any real community of being, so to speak, between the Father and the exalted person called His Son. To the minds of the Three Hundred—at any rate, of their leaders—this was a virtual denial of the peerless Sonship; they resolved, therefore, on inserting the word "ousia" into a phrase which should guard that Sonship, and probably remembered that it was anyhow *ejusdem generis* with the terms above referred to as used in the New Testament. The description of the Son, then, in the creed was to run thus: "Begotten of the Father, Only-begotten, *that is, from the Father's essence;*" then, as in the Cæsarean document, "God from God." It has been thought (by the late Dr. Hort) that in this collocation of terms, "Only-begotten" was intended to be strictly connected with "God from God," in accordance with a famous various reading in John i. 18, which was repeatedly adopted by writers of this century; but it would hardly be natural to interpolate the clause beginning, "that is," between an adjective and a substantive. After "God from God," were added "Light from Light," and, by way of strengthening the emphasis, "Very (or Real) God from Very God." But even this

had been found open to evasion; and the compilers of the proposed formulary considered it desirable, or rather necessary, to enforce the idea conveyed by "from the essence" by adding the momentous words, "Of one essence," or "co-essential, with the Father." Here the term *homoousion* was to guard and sustain the phrase "from the essence." It would be recommended by the fact that it had been accepted by Dionysius of Alexandria, when he was suspected of minimising the real divinity of the Son of God. Yet there were, no doubt, grave difficulties in the way of its adoption. To take one point, it had been used of separate individuals belonging to the same "class," and, as such, possessing, in the common phrase, the same "nature." Irenæus had repeatedly described the Valentinians as employing it of the beings who, in their wild mythology, were thus cognate; and so Neo-Platonism had called the human soul "homoousion," or akin to God. Thus it would be easy to attach to it, as theologically used, a sense suggestive of Tritheism, or at any rate of what the "Quicunque" calls a "division of the substance," a practical negation of the "Co-inherence," with the result that distinctness would be thought of as separation. Secondly, it had been yet further discredited by conveying to some minds the purport of a completely opposite error: as *ousia* had been used for individual existence, *homoousion*, as applied to the Son in relation to the Father, might introduce a Sabellian "confusion of the Persons," and this misconstruction was long afterwards sufficiently serious to be dealt with by Epiphanius and St. Ambrose. Thirdly, it had been associated with ideas of division or partition of an already existing "essence," as when Paul of Samosata in 269 had sophistically argued, "If the Son of God be *homoousios*, He and the Father must have two *ousiai*, derived from one pre-existing *ousia*;" and the Council of Antioch, not seeing their way through this embarrassment of the question, had forborne to employ the term. And lastly, there were still adhering to it some materialistic associations such as still adhere, in popular English use, to the term "substance;" and thus an objector would take up his parable against giving countenance to a "carnal" and heathenish notion of Deity. And the Arians had already marked the term in question for censure—had denied, as in Arius's "Thalia," that the Son was "homoousios" with God; or had even confidently urged, as fatal to their opponents' doctrine, that it implied this inadmissible, intolerable "co-essentiality." The orthodox could not have been expected to foresee the obstinate

persistency of objections to the term, the difficulty which would be found in detaching it from various misconceptions, and the continuous necessity of protesting, as Athanasius and Hilary did long afterwards, that Churchmen were "not bound by what Greeks said," and that "the Church abhorred and rejected" the inference which her opponents drew from the Homoousion; yet they must have been conscious that there was some risk in thus committing the Church to a new type of doctrinal phraseology. But still, when all was said, it seemed to them that the Arianizers' repugnance to the term indicated its value as a safeguard of orthodoxy; and, as Professor Gwatkin condenses the issue, "They *could not leave it an open question whether the Lord is truly God or not.*" "Some phrase," they would say, "we must adopt, and here is one to our hand. No doubt, it has been used in ways which we absolutely repudiate; we are not bound to the notions, for instance, which heathen philosophers or Gnostics have attached to it; we can make clear, beyond dispute, the sense in which *we* employ it, and that sense is clear of Sabellianism, for we confess a true Son of a true Father, and clear also (as the Emperor himself has pointed out) of any carnal notion of a division of Godhead, for we proclaim the Godhead to be spiritual and indivisible. Do you ask *why* we use a phrase whose meaning needs to be ascertained with such careful distinctness? It is you who, by your facility in explaining away Scripture terms, constrain us to use it, to vindicate its sound meaning, to follow the precedent set by earlier Church-writers who have understood it as we understand it, as the expression of a Divine Sonship which is 'only,' genuine, absolute, and true. Those who really believe in such a Sonship will see their way, if they are reasonable, to accepting the 'Homoousion' as expressing it; and we, by inserting it into our Creed, while our intention in so doing is manifest, shall be at once excluding a profane heresy which is deadly to men's faith, and giving force and distinctness to the religious conceptions of the faithful. Therefore we write it down thus: 'Co-essential with the Father.' It is our 'bulwark against irreligious conceptions,' and it is also our tribute of devotion to the Son of God."

Such appear to have been the motives of those who were charged with the duty of framing a formulary, in regard to the insertion of the Homoousion. They cannot, on this view, be accused of academic pedantry, of a taste for "technical subtleties" as such. That taste was Arian, not Catholic. It was the Arians

who indulged it to the full, who insisted on following out those speculations respecting the nature of Deity which, as Dr. Wace says, "have always had such a terrible fascination for the Eastern mind;" it was they who developed an extraordinary fertility in the multiplication of formularies—"a creed for every year or every month," says Hilary with pardonable exaggeration; it was they whose methods were largely borrowed from the Greek schools of disputation, and whose positive love of subtle disquisition compelled the Catholics, as Hilary puts it, to "speak out as to what was really ineffable," and thereby to expose it to some "risk." Or in the words of a great Nonconformist, "It is not the orthodox who are ultimately responsible for the 'presumption' with which they alone are charged." It would, indeed, have been childish to attempt to banish metaphysics from theology. Any religion with a doctrine about God or man must, as such, be metaphysical. "To talk of a person," says Liddon, "carries us at once into the very heart of metaphysics:" and when once the question was asked among professors of the religion which is centred in the person of Jesus Christ, "Who is Jesus Christ, that He should be believed in as no other man is believed in by us?"—a question which, as Canon Gore has said, "Christians must have asked because they were men endowed with reason"—the answer must have "involved metaphysics," but metaphysics as a means to an end. For the real aim of the Nicene fathers (as Mr. Strong has pointed out in his "Manual of Theology") was moral rather than theoretical—was the very opposite to the animus which inspired "Hellenic" speculation; it was to provide a doctrinal expression of the devotion of Christians to their Redeemer, to give a *rationale* of His "absolute supremacy" over the mind, the heart, and the life. As Dr. Bigg puts it in his volume on Neo-Platonism, "the Nicene definition rested on Scripture, on the religious experience, on the Christian doctrine of redemption; in a word, on a wholly different cycle of thought" from that of any form of Greek philosophy. "The three hypostases of the Neo-Platonist really formed but one, and that an incomplete, because purely intellectual, person;" whereas Christian Trinitarianism grew out of the worship of the Christian's Redeemer. Or if it is objected that the Trinitarian idea, or the idea of a really Divine Christ, which the Nicenes were determined to secure, is itself alien from the original Christianity, the reply must take the form of a fair interpretation of the Christology of St. Paul and St. John, with a view to disproving

the adventurous assertion that the Church of the first century was "Ebionitic," and to show that it was belief in a Divine Son, and through Him in a Divine Spirit—a belief, as Dr. Wace and Dr. Dale have reminded us, present in solution in whole pages of the Epistles from which no "proof-texts" could be quoted—which led to belief in the Trinity as the safeguard of Monotheism. If, again, it is contended that although some germs of such ideas are discernible here and there in the New Testament, yet the Nicene dogma unduly consolidates and systematizes what those germs tentatively indicate, and is, in short, an illegitimate "development" of them, so that to "serve it heir" to the apostolic belief is a procedure unwarranted by history; we reply that the "dogma" is really no bigger and fuller in its content than that belief, although it gives greater precision and exactness to what the first disciples had come to hold, but could not at once apprehend in all its bearings. The way to test this is to ask, What proposition, logically involved in the Nicene terms, is alien to the New Testament Christology, or goes beyond the confession, "My Lord and *my God*"?

To return to our narrative: the foremost among the Nicenes —specially active, as we might say, in the committee appointed for the arrangement of these terms—were Hosius, Alexander, Athanasius as his deacon, and, as pre-eminently effective in the last debate, probably Marcellus of Ancyra, and Eustathius of Antioch; and others who had shown themselves worthy of the confidence of the majority were doubtless employed in the work. The Creed as framed was based on existing formularies; and, as we have seen, there is good reason to think that several such creeds had been read in the Council besides that of Eusebius of Cæsarea, which, with that of Jerusalem in a less degree, was virtually adopted as a base. But other creeds served, probably, to supply materials for the "Nicene." The truth is, that in considering the Nicene dogma, as formally stated and authoritatively published, we must avoid two grave mistakes. In the first place, it would be erroneous to see in that dogma nothing else than a simple iteration of pre-existing Church statements, with the addition of an important phrase or two, or in other words, nothing else than the result of mere "traditionalism" crushing down discussion, and rigidly enforcing on the whole Christian commonwealth propositions which suited the taste of a hierarchical majority. For there was, as we have seen, a real debate on the merits of the case, a genuine desire

to meet objections, and to come definitely into contact with the thoughts which the controversy had stirred; there was a readiness to appeal to Scripture as the "document of proof,"—even a disposition to choose, if possible, Scriptural phraseology in the expression of Church belief, to find in apostolic words a central point of doctrinal unity. In the second place, we must avoid the opposite error of ignoring the ecclesiastical or conservative tone of the Nicene fathers. This error may assume two forms: 1. To say that "the eager discussions of Nicæa present the first grand precedent for the duty of private judgement," is to employ language somewhat ambiguous, but, if taken in one sense, signally paradoxical: for, in fact, the temper of the great representative assembly of the Church was one which could hardly have so much as apprehended the standpoint of modern religious individualism. 2. Again, to say that the Homoousion added a new idea to the doctrinal stores of the Church—that it was an instance of what has been called "accretive development"—is to forget that it was adopted as expressing neither less nor more than this, that the Son of God was God's true Son, and Himself strictly and properly God, "literally of, and in, the one indivisible Essence," and not outside that Essence, *i.e.* not a creature; and that this belief in "one God" as existing "in Trinity" had lain close to the very heart of the Church from the very beginning of her career. Any relation of the Nicene Creed to earlier local formulas is full of interest and value, as helping us to identify its teaching, by means of diverse lines of ecclesiastical confession, with the original "deposit" of faith committed by the apostles to the Churches. The Three Hundred, coming together, could attest in combination the belief which they had severally inherited; and the doctrine which they promulgated in conformity with that belief would secure and enshrine the elements of Apostolical Christianity. So it was that, after a thoughtful survey of the subject, in harmony with the Churchly spirit, and in fidelity to transmitted belief and worship, the great Creed was written out, and doubtless read aloud in full Council, in the Emperor's presence, apparently by Hermogenes, afterwards bishop of Cappadocian Cæsarea:—

> "We believe in One God, the Father Almighty,
> Maker of all things both visible and invisible:
> And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God,
> Begotten of the Father, Only-begotten,

That is, from the Essence of the Father,
God from God, Light from Light,
Very God from Very God,
Begotten, not made, *Of one essence with the Father;*
By whom all things, both in heaven and earth, were made;
Who for us men and for our salvation
Came down, and was incarnate, and became man,
Suffered, and rose again the third day;
Ascended into the heavens;
Cometh to judge the quick and dead.
And in the Holy Spirit."

Such was the Creed proper: and we may observe in passing, as to one clause, that there is no reason for attaching to the words "for (on account of) us men" a different sense from that which is indicated in the next words, "for our salvation," as if the first words committed the Church to the speculation that the Lord would have "been incarnate" even if He had not come as our Saviour. The abrupt conclusion of the Creed was afterwards accounted for by the non-existence at this period of any controversy as to the Third Person of the Trinity. To the Creed thus completed, was added, by way of more complete security to faith, a condemnation of Arian errors:—

"But those who say,
'Once He was not,'
And—'Before He was begotten, He was not,'
And—'He came into existence out of what was not,'
Or—'That the Son of God was of a different "hypostasis" or "ousia,"'
Or—'That He was made,' or—'is (was) changeable or mutable,'

are anathematized by the Catholic and Apostolic Church of God." Of these anathemas it is only necessary to say that the second proposition condemned by them was an Arian inference from the supposition that the "generation" was an *event*;—"whereas He was (at some inconceivably remote period) "begotten," of course He had no existence before that period;" and that "hypostasis" must be taken as used in the sense, not of "person," but of "essence," or, as Latins would say, "substance"—the sense which, although not invariably, was yet most frequently given to the term in the

ante-Nicene period—so that "hypostasis" is here a synonym for "ousia."

The Creed, as thus framed and presented, was at once received by the great body of the Nicene fathers. There were, however, objections made by the small knot of Arianizing bishops. Eusebius of Nicomedia, Theognis, Maris, Theonas, and Secundus, argued thus: "If the Son is *homoousios* with the Father, it must be by germination, as a sprout from a root; or by derivation, as a child from a parent; or by division, as two or three pieces of gold from a lump. But in none of these ways is the Son related to the Father." Eusebius of Cæsarea, also, at first, found great difficulty in the Homoousion.. His motive as a theologian was, as we have seen, most probably dread of Sabellianism; and he had persuaded himself that the new term would open a door to it. He persisted, for one day, in his objections; but on the next day, finding that the Emperor acquiesced in the Homoousion (although, as it would appear, from a grave misconception of what was meant by the Divine Sonship), that the majority who received it absolutely disclaimed any materialistic sense for it, and affirmed that the Divine Essence was not capable of division or alteration, and that earlier Church-writers had employed the term—especially, that his beloved Pamphilus had unhesitatingly adduced Origen as admitting it,—he made up his mind to accept the phrase, and afterwards wrote a letter to the people of his diocese in explanation of his conduct: a letter, it must be observed, which (even setting apart one really "heterodox paragraph" which is not in the letter as given by Socrates) does not greatly reassure us as to his own convictions, or as to his sense of duty in the construction of words. Others, who went further in the Arian direction than he did, yielded at last with more reluctance, and only, as it would appear, in order to avoid disgrace and banishment; for Constantine was now bent on establishing the Creed accepted by the Three Hundred, and punishing any bishop who refused to sign it. Thus "Maris reluctantly put his name to the document;" Eusebius and Theognis signed the Creed, and were erroneously supposed to have signed it without the anathemas; "Secundus and Theonas," says Neale, "alone had courage and honesty to stand firm in their sentiments," and accordingly the Council condemned them with Arius, who had not even been asked to recant, and accept the Homoousion, his heresy being too notorious, and his persistency in it already proved. The Arians, who of course regarded Secundus as a confessor, believed that he,

on receiving his sentence of exile from Constantine, turned to Eusebius of Nicomedia with indignant scorn, and said, "You signed to escape exile; but I am confident, on the ground of a revelation from God, that within a year you will be sent into exile too." The condemnation pronounced by the Council on these two prelates, as well as on Arius, extended itself to the original companions of the latter; and the words in which Julius of Rome afterwards narrated the fact may fitly conclude our survey of the Nicene proceedings against Arianism: "For theirs was no ordinary offence, nor had they sinned against man, but against our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, the Son of the living God."

CHAPTER VII.

THE NICENE COUNCIL.—PART II.

Two other special pieces of business, important in their several ways, though not to be compared to the Arian question in momentousness, remained for the Nicene Council. The first was the settlement of the Meletian troubles; the second was the settlement of the Easter-controversy.

I. The letter of the Council to the Alexandrian Church announces the resolution arrived at in regard to what is there called the "impetuosity," or "headlong rashness," of Meletius, and those whom he had "ordained." "In strictness," say the bishops, Meletius deserves no favour; "but he is dealt with indulgently, for we allow him to remain in his own city, and to retain a nominal dignity, but not to lay on hands, nor to announce his intention of doing so, either there or anywhere else." He is thus received into Church communion, and not treated as a degraded ex-prelate; but those whom he had appointed were to be "confirmed by a more sacred *cheirotonia* (ordination)." The phrase would strictly mean that the Meletian ordinations, being schismatical, were held to be null: *cheirotonia* is the usual term for ordination, and in the seventh Nicene canon ex-Novatian clerics are allowed to rank with the clergy "on receiving imposition of hands," which is most naturally understood of a new ordination, although in both cases some writers have supposed the words to mean merely a benedictory act, intended to make ministrations regular. After this rite, whatever was its import, they were to retain the rank to which Meletius had advanced them, but to yield precedence to those who had been ordained by Alexander, and not to "announce an intention to ordain, nor to submit names for approval, nor to do any episcopal act, without the consent of" the Catholic bishops of their cities: on the death of any such bishop, an ex-Meletian bishop might succeed

him, if found worthy, and preferred by the people (whose right to express their mind is called a "choice"), and approved by the see of Alexandria; but such promotion is denied, in perpetuity, to Meletius himself. This was the decision, more generous perhaps than prudent; and Athanasius did not scruple, in after-days, to express his regret that the Council had been so forbearing.

II. The "Easter-controversy" was of very old standing; it had disturbed the Church in the second century. Polycarp and Anicetus, Polycrates and Victor, had taken opposite sides as to the time for closing the fast kept in preparation for the great annual solemnity which probably began to be observed in the sub-apostolic period, by "custom," as Socrates says, not by any apostolic ordinance, for "none of the apostles legislated on the subject." The minority—the Christians of Proconsular Asia and some other neighbouring districts—said in effect, "Let us keep to the fourteenth evening of Nisan as the starting-point of our feast, on whatever day of the week it may happen to fall." They seem to have spent the first part of that day in a fast commemorative of the Passion, and in the evening to have celebrated the Holy Communion in thanksgiving for the Redemption as issuing in the Resurrection. Socrates expresses this by saying, "They disregarded the Sabbath," that is, they did not make a point of not concluding their fast before the Saturday. The majority insisted that the fast should be closed on a Saturday evening, and the Resurrection celebrated on a Sunday morning, "the first day of the week," on whatever day of the Jewish first month it might fall. Their motto, therefore, was, "No Judaizing as to Easter!" Their principle, being clearly more Christian than that of the Quartodecimans, gradually prevailed: Quartodecimanism died out during the third century in the province of Proconsular Asia, once its stronghold; but a new difficulty had arisen out of a difference among the Jews themselves, for some of them, contrary to their old traditions, had taken to keeping Passover *before* the vernal equinox. This produced a confusion: for whereas the equinox belonged to the solar year, the Passover-day, being the fourteenth of a month, was governed by the lunar; and thus if in a particular year Nisan 14 was reckoned as falling before the equinox, and therefore Passover was kept before a new solar year had begun, there would be two passovers in one solar year, one after one vernal equinox, and the other just before the next; and long after the Council, Epiphanius said that "the Jews did not care to be exact on this point:" they had not studied the

astronomical question. The old usage of keeping Passover *after* the equinox was maintained in its application to the Christian solemnity by such authorities as Hippolytus, Dionysius of Alexandria, and Anatolius of Laodicea (who, as quoted by Eusebius, refers to Jewish writers), although as to the right day of the equinox these writers were not precisely agreed, and Alexandrian usage finally fixed it on March 21. But a certain number of Christians followed the prevailing Jewish custom, although, says Socrates, they admitted that it was not accurate. And this brings us to consider the position of those Syrians, Cilicians, Mesopotamians, who just before the Nicene Council were known to keep Easter when the Jews kept Passover, as the Council says in a letter; "following the Jewish custom," says Constantine; Athanasius twice speaks to the same effect, and says that herein they "walked lamely." What does this general language mean? That they were Quartodecimans pure and simple, is one view; but Sozomen says that they kept the feast in a "*somewhat* Jewish fashion," which would suggest a different view. Socrates seems to identify them with those who kept Easter before the equinox; and this falls in with the stress laid by Constantine in his letter after the Council on the anomalous results of such a practice, and would account for his exhortation to have "*nothing* in common with the Jews." And that principle would also require, as Hefele says, that even if the 14th coincided with a Sunday, the Christian Easter should be deferred until the Sunday following (the point urged against the Celtic usage, in the seventh century, by advocates of the Catholic or Continental). The result of the discordant observance was, that some Christians were keeping the preparatory fast, while others were exulting in their "day of splendour" and in the festivities which followed it; and here the reader of our early English Church history may be reminded that even when it was acknowledged on both sides that Easter-day must always be a Sunday, a king accustomed to the Celtic reckoning (which admitted the "14th day" among possible Easter Sundays) was enjoying his Easter, while his queen, who adhered to the "Catholic" method, was "keeping the day of Palms." Constantine's letter gives us rhetoric when we want accurate information; but it is curious to see how at that period men still spoke of the "holy day of Pasch" as the "one festal day of our redemption, that is, of our Saviour's Passion," *and* as "the feast from which we have received our hopes of immortality"—the idea of redemption being thus

bound up with that of the Resurrection. But when a special day, Good Friday, came to be devoted to the commemoration of the Passion as such, it was too late to restrict to it the "paschal" associations which St. Paul had connected with the sacrificial death: they had been freely applied to the Resurrection-festival itself, and a confusion of ideas established itself in the ritual language of Greek and Latin Christendom. But as to what the Council of Nicæa enacted, we can apparently say thus much: it unanimously resolved that the custom of the majority should become the custom of all, and undertook to enforce with plenary authority the resolution of the Council of Arles as to uniformity of Easter-time observance, and that on the lines following: (1) Easter-day to be always a Sunday; (2) but whenever the 14th of Nisan is a Sunday, the festival is to be held on the Sunday after, (3) and always *after* the vernal equinox. If we could rely on a statement by Leo the Great in the fifth century, the Council delegated to the see of Alexandria the duty of ascertaining, for each year, by help of the traditional Egyptian skill in such calculations, the right time for observing the great festival, and of communicating this information in good time to the see of Rome, whence, by an extension of the custom which had been recognised for the West by the Council of Arles, the exact day should be made known to remoter churches. The difficulty of this statement lies in the fact that for years after the Nicene Council the Roman Church differed from the Alexandrian as to the right date of the equinox, which the Romans wrongly placed on March 18, and the Alexandrians correctly on March 21; so that in 387 the Alexandrian Easter was five weeks later than the Roman. Another statement, that the Council authorised a scheme or "cycle" which settled the recurrence of Easter during nineteen years, is not borne out by the contemporary documents; and still less warrant can be found, as Bishop Lightfoot has shown, for the further assertion that Eusebius of Cæsarea was appointed to frame this cycle, for it had been applied to the determination of Easter by Anatolius, forty years previously, and was in use at Alexandria. We can easily see how naturally the great Council would be afterwards credited with more than in fact it achieved.

For the twenty genuine Canons of Nicæa, I may refer to my *Notes on the Canons of the First Four General Councils;* but something may be said here as to a few of them which bear directly on the Church history of the period.

The third, for instance, illustrates the acceptance, in general, by the Church, of the political division of the empire into "eparchies" or provinces, as the base of a corresponding division into provincial churches. The civil metropolis was also the ecclesiastical. The "præses" or "consularis" had his double, so to speak, in the metropolitan bishop. This parallelism had grown up naturally: as "all roads led to Rome," as the imperial city was constantly receiving visitors from all parts of the "orbis Romanus," so in various minor degrees the great provincial capitals were centres to which persons of all classes resorted, and it needed but the simplest ecclesiastical common sense to recognise that fact in its application to the church "dwelling in" the capital, and to the chief pastor of that church as an appropriate leader and virtual superior for the bishops of the dependent towns. Thus the metropolitan authority grew up without any formal enactment; it found its place ready made, and was ere long taken as a matter of course. Thence came the institution of provincial synods, held periodically under the presidency of the metropolitan. The assembled bishops would decide as to the appointment to a vacant see; or, if all could not meet for this purpose, the business would be performed by three at least, holding proxies for their absent colleagues, and having the metropolitan's sanction for their act—a condition on which the fourth canon insists. These assemblies were also useful for the reconsideration of censures pronounced by individual bishops; if the Council affirms such a sentence, the whole Church is bound to respect it; if, on the other hand, it is deemed to have been due to party spirit or personal ill-temper—a possibility recognised with suggestive frankness—it would be rescinded, and a synodical meeting held in Lent would thus afford a good opportunity for the restoration of friendly relations in time for the Easter Eucharist.

A remarkable instance of the conformity of ecclesiastical relations to civil is exhibited in the arrangement made with respect to the churches of Palestine. If purely religious associations were to decide such points, they would certainly have made Jerusalem metropolitical: but the centre of provincial government, as we learn from the "Acts," was not Jerusalem, but Cæsarea; and therefore, all such associations notwithstanding, the bishop of Cæsarea is acknowledged to be metropolitan over all the bishops in the province, including the successor of St. James "the Just," the chief pastor of the mother-church of Christendom, to whom

"ancient custom" gives only an honorary precedency among the suffragans of the metropolitan see.

We may now look at the sixth canon, by far the most important of all the twenty. It is literally this: "Let the ancient customs which exist in Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis prevail, so that the bishop of Alexandria shall have authority over all these districts; since this is also customary for the bishop who is at Rome. Similarly at Antioch, and in the other provinces, the privileges are to be secured to the churches. And this is thoroughly clear, that if any one is made a bishop without the metropolitan's approval, the great Synod rules that such a one ought not to be a bishop. If, however, two or three from personal contentiousness oppose the common vote of all, which has been passed reasonably and according to Church rule, let the vote of the majority prevail." Such is the Greek text; such also, substantially, is the rendering of the oldest Latin versions. Of these, the first in point of antiquity, brought home, it seems, from Nicæa, by Cæcilian of Carthage, begins, "Antiqua per Egyptum adque (*sic*) Pentapolim consuetudo servetur, ut Alexandrinus episcopus horum habeat sollicitudinem: quoniam et urbis Romæ episcopo similis mos est." The second, which was carefully made at Constantinople in 419, by comparison of the "Vetus" with the authenticated original, and under the supervision of Atticus the bishop, gives the same meaning. A Sicilian-Italian version, produced by Roman delegates at the Council of Chalcedon in 451, reads, "Quod ecclesia Romana semper habuit primatum: teneat autem et Ægyptus, ut episcopus Alexandriæ omnium habeat potestatem, quoniam et Romano episcopo hæc est consuetudo." But this deviation from the text is ignored by the versions of Dionysius Exiguus and Isidore, and by the one read in the Council of Carthage in 525, "Antiqui mores obtineant qui apud Ægyptum sunt, ut Alexandriæ episcopus omnium habeat potestatem; quia et urbis Romæ episcopis hoc solitum est." Now for the purport. First of all, we may assume it as certain that the Meletian disorders were the occasion of this law. Meletius had violated the established rights of the see of Alexandria by his insubordinate proceedings in Thebais, and elsewhere in Egypt. The bishop of Alexandria, by old custom, was supreme throughout a wide extent of country which, according to the civil division of the empire as organized under Constantine, embraced five provinces ultimately placed under the rule of the

"Augustal prefect." It appears that there were no metropolitans, properly speaking, under the "Evangelist's throne;" the occupant of that throne administered ecclesiastical affairs, consecrated bishops (and even, as some writers say, ordained priests), throughout the hundred bishoprics which at this period were under his sway. The Council intends to safeguard these rights of the bishop of Alexandria; and, in doing so, it cites the case of the bishop of Rome as a parallel and a warrant, *i.e.* it assumes that, as a fact, the see of Rome has full ecclesiastical jurisdiction, without the intervention of metropolitans, over a certain part of the Western Church. What the part was, the Council unfortunately does not say. Rufinus said, in his lax summary of the canon, "the suburbicarian churches;" the Latin version called "Prisca," which introduced this sixth canon with the gravely incorrect title, "On the Primacy of the Roman Church," and followed this up by "It is an ancient usage that the bishop of Rome should have *principatum*," proceeded to say, "that he should rule with his solicitude the 'suburbicarian' places, *et omnem provinciam*," only then bringing in the mention of Alexandria! The so-called "Vetus" has the phrase "suburbicarian places," which, however, does not appear in the version made by order of Atticus, and may probably have found its way into the Vetus from Rufinus. Be this as it may, the question arises, What would "suburbicarian" mean as a political term in the fourth century? The common view, that it applies to the ten provinces of Central and Southern Italy and of the great adjacent islands, which were under the jurisdiction of the Vicarius Urbis, may now be regarded as established. Repeatedly, in the eleventh book of the Theodosian Code, we find mention of "suburbicariæ" or "subicariæ regiones," a phrase quite incompatible with the notion that the term in question belongs merely to the district within a hundred miles of Rome, which, together with the city itself, was administered by the Præfectus Urbi. This opinion is advocated by Hefele; but it may suffice to say that such an interpretation of "suburbicarian" would stultify the canon before us, for so small a territory could furnish no analogy in point of extent to the region over which the Alexandrian bishop was ecclesiastically supreme; whereas the two provinces called "Egypt," the two called Libya (one being Pentapolis), and the Thebaid, might practically be deemed a fair equivalent to Campania, Tuscia and Umbria, Picenum, Apulia and Calabria, Bruttii and Lucania, Samnium,

Valeria, Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica. It thus appears that the bishop of Rome did not at this time exercise metropolitan or primatial jurisdiction over those northern provinces which were called "Italy" in a restrictive sense, and were governed by the "Vicar of Italy" under one of the Prætorian prefects. Still less can we ascribe to him in 325 a patriarchate extending beyond the peninsula. Many years had to pass before he could include—step after step, and largely by imperial aid—the greater part of the West in his ecclesiastical realm; and as the hundred miles' distance from Rome would give too small an area for the purpose of the canon, so the whole West would be too large, and the parallel implied would have been seriously impaired, or rather would have been pointless.

To return: if the Roman bishop were supreme within certain limits, if he could act, within those limits, as virtual patriarch and sole metropolitan (save that Syracuse and Caliaris appear to have been, or ere long to have become, metropolitical), his position would be conveniently analogous to that which the Council was securing for Alexandria. Their words come to this: "Let the see of Alexandria continue to hold within the countries of Egypt, Libya, etc., that full, direct power over the bishops which the see of Rome holds in its own sphere. Such as Rome in this respect is, such Alexandria has, by old usage, a right to be." Not a word, we see, about any peculiar and universal prerogatives inherent in the Roman see as such; not a word, in short, about a *Papacy*. If Roman writers plead that the Council was not concerned to speak of the Roman bishop as "Pope," but only as quasi-patriarch, and therefore that the canon might leave his papal claims on one side without implying a negation of them, and that in any case it says nothing of his acknowledged "precedency," the answer is that the matter in hand is jurisdiction, and that therefore a simple "precedency" would not be relevant; but that, jurisdiction being concerned, the language of the canon is such as would be natural for those who knew nothing of such claims, but unnatural, or indeed impossible, for those who held the Papacy to be the very basis of Church life. *They* would have taken care to recognise, by a very unequivocal saving clause, the transcendent and unique authority attaching to the "bishop at Rome" as Supreme Pontiff—according to the present Roman doctrine, as absolute monarch of the Church throughout the world.

But the canon proceeds to place in the same category the

Church of Antioch; no doubt there was a desire to honour the orthodox Eustathius, as well as to preserve the rights of the native church of the "Christian" name. Hitherto, there has been no difficulty in seeing that the canon refers to the pre-eminent sees, which were already in effect, though not in title, nor even in fulness of organization, patriarchal. But the words, "Likewise in Antioch, and in the other provinces, let the churches be secured in their privileges," are relied on by those who (as Beveridge) deny any reference in this canon to anything beyond the ordinary metropolitan powers. "For a province belongs," they say, "not to a patriarch or quasi-patriarch, but to a simple metropolitan; it is therefore *his* privileges that in this passage, and throughout the canon, are contemplated by the Council." In reply to this it is urged, that not only do Innocent I., and before him Jerome, regard this canon as affirming the patriarchal jurisdiction of Antioch, but the Council of Constantinople in 381 refers to it as saving the privileges of that see; and that as to "provinces," the term may be taken in a special sense as denoting the "dioceses," as they would be more properly called, of Pontus, Proconsular Asia, and Thrace, consisting of groups of provinces under the quasi-patriarchs, or "exarchs," or primates, of Cæsarea, Ephesus, and Heraclea. But this restriction of the term does not seem necessary; the canon may well be taken to mean, "Let all churches have their respective privileges intact: the special powers of the see of Alexandria, as of Rome,—and also the rights of Antioch, and the rights of metropolitans, too, in the various provinces,—all, be they greater or smaller, shall be respected; we will uphold, for each case, the *status quo*." And thus the canon passes on to speak of metropolitan rights simply, and so of the power of a provincial synod. As Le Quien says, "the Nicene Council, having confirmed to the see of Alexandria, just as to that of Rome, its ancient rights, took care to add, that similarly at Antioch, and in the other provinces, every see and church should retain its own honour, so that the see of Antioch should be reckoned as the third among sees, and, according to ancient usage, should govern the provinces of the East."

A rule against translation or removal of bishops from one see to another, or of clerics from one charge to another, illustrates a fact of which we have but too many illustrations—the growth of secularity which had attended the Church's sudden exit from the gloom of persecution into the sunshine of prosperity. Men whose

sacred functions had not made them less open to the temptations of the world were apt to become discontented in comparatively obscure positions, to solicit and scheme for promotion to bishoprics more conspicuous or more lucrative, or to clerical spheres more attractive to ambition. This tendency, which illustrates the contrast drawn by Queen Caroline between Bishop Wilson and certain English prelates, was the main reason for a restrictive rule against "translations," which yet was not understood so absolutely as to preclude such changes when they might seem on public grounds desirable or expedient. Another evil, less serious but not trivial, was the restlessness which not unnaturally came over some clerical minds amid the new guarantees of universal security: ecclesiastics had yielded to "a truant disposition," and taken to roving aimlessly about; they were to be checked by disciplinary action, and sent home to their own churches.

The subject of the "Lapsi," so much before the thought of the Ancyran and Neocæsarean Councils, was again taken up by the Nicene. According to a story current in the next century, Constantine asked the Novatian bishop Acesius, whom he had on his own authority invited to the Council, whether he agreed with the doctrinal settlement and with the rule as to Easter. He answered, "Yes, they are both in accordance with what I have received by tradition." "Then why do you stand aloof from the Church?" "Because my predecessors, in the Decian persecution, ruled that those who had sinned unto death" (he alluded primarily to apostasy) "must not be admitted to the divine mysteries, but exhorted to repent, and to hope for God's mercy otherwise than through ordinances from which their fall had permanently excluded them." The Emperor, impatient at what seemed to him an arrogant rigorism, answered with humorous brusqueness, "Take a ladder, then, for yourself, and go up to heaven your own way." Acesius was evidently content with his own exclusiveness; but the Council thought fit to provide for possible cases of Novatian disposition to join the Church. Those, then, who had belonged to their ministry (which, it must be understood, was as "episcopal" as that of the Church) were to be retained in their rank by an "imposition of hands" (which has been already alluded to), after promising in writing "not to refuse to communicate with persons who had been twice married, or with 'Lapsi' going through a prescribed penance, and to follow in all things the 'decrees of the Church Catholic.'" If they lived in a place devoid of other clergy, they might officiate;

and a Catholic bishop might give to an ex-Novatian bishop the office of "chorepiscopus," or the mere rank of a bishop, or even of a priest—this in order to uphold the principle that there were "not to be two bishops in one city," *i.e.* that there could be but one bishop *of* each city—as we should say, one single diocesan.

"Lapsi," however penitent and dutiful, were to be incapable of ordination; and any whom bishops, knowingly or not, had ordained, were to be deposed. Persons who, under the recent "tyranny of Licinius," had lapsed without any strong pressure or peril, were to be treated with an indulgence which they had not deserved: they should be penitents—"Hearers" for three years, "Kneelers" for seven, and for two years more "Co-standers," joining in the prayers of the faithful (that is, in the whole Eucharistic service), but "not partaking in the Oblation," that is, the elements that had been "offered." In some cases, military officers, called upon to choose between their faith and their army-rank, had at first "thrown away their belts," the badge of the latter, and afterwards, as if repenting of their own religious fidelity, had procured, perhaps by bribes, restoration to rank and employment; and then again, in remorse, they besought the Church's favour. It would be necessary to test their sincerity and steadfastness by keeping them among Hearers for three years, and then, if proved to be truly contrite, they might pass at once into the class of Co-standers. "But if they showed indifference, and were evidently treating a formal exclusion from Church communion as of itself securing their conversion, they must go through the full time." This mild rule indicates a wish not to press hardly on men of high standing in the army. The last canon on this subject refers in the first instance to Lapsi who were surprised by fatal illness before they had gone through their penance-time; it confirms "the old canonical law that no one, at the point of death, should be deprived of the last and most necessary *viaticum*," the Holy Communion as provision for the soul; and it emphasizes this rule as applying to all dying persons whose state of mind satisfies the bishop. But if a penitent, thus communicated, recovers, he must for a time rank with the Co-standers.

One rule proposed was not adopted by the Council. It was to the effect that persons in holy orders were not to be allowed to live as married men. The venerable Paphnutius opposed this restriction, and contended that it would suffice to retain the "ancient tradition" which forbade men already ordained to marry

—a "tradition" already noticed. Paphnutius carried the Council with him; but Rome ere long took up the rigorist line which he had deprecated.

The Emperor was minded to connect the close of the Council's proceedings with the festival of his own "Vicennalia," the completion of nineteen years of his reign, which entered on its twentieth year on July 25, 325. He invited the bishops to a splendid feast in the central apartment of the palace; they passed through the ranks of armed body-guards in the vestibule, and found tables and seats arranged in the banquet-chamber. Some, doubtless the most dignified of their number, were seated at the Emperor's own table. "It seemed," says Eusebius, "like an image of the kingdom of Christ!" The Emperor gave princely gifts to the bishops, according to their several deserts; and on another day, he addressed them in a farewell speech, exhorting to mutual goodwill, brotherly forbearance on the part of the abler towards the inferior or weaker brethren, concord and unanimity for the sake of the common cause, and charitable self-adaptation to varieties of character and motive in order to win all classes to the truth. "Be like wise physicians, who treat different cases with discrimination, and are all things to all. And now, farewell, and pray earnestly for me."

In closing the scenes of the greatest of all Synods, we need not draw on the stores of legendary fancy in order to stimulate our perception of its greatness. The Council of Nicæa is what it is to us quite apart from all doubtful or apocryphal traditions: it holds a pre-eminent place of honour, because it established for all ages of the Church that august and inestimable confession, which may be to unbelief, or to the anti-dogmatic spirit, a mere stumbling-block, a mere incubus, because it is looked at *ab extra*, in a temper which cannot sympathise with the faith which it enshrines, or the adoration which it stimulates; but to those who genuinely and definitely believe in the true divinity of the Redeemer, the doctrine of Nicæa, in the expanded form which Christendom has adopted, is a prime treasure of their religious life, the expression of a faith coherent in itself, and capable of overcoming the world in the power of the Incarnate who is the "Co-essential," that is, as St. Athanasius was careful to explain it, the "real" Son of God.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE SHORT INTERNAL PEACE.

THE time usually assigned for the close of the Nicene Council is the 25th of August, 325. The bishops, no doubt, set their faces homeward, after the Emperor's farewell banquet, with hearts relieved from a great anxiety, and disposed to dwell thankfully on the present, and to look forward hopefully into the future. It would, perhaps, have seemed to them not only chilling, but faithless, to augur a revival of the controversial distresses and trials of the six years preceding the Great Council; they would "thank God, and take courage," putting aside fear about a peril that seemed to have spent its force. In truth, it was an epoch at which fearless gladness might be deemed a manifest duty. The great old question, "What think ye of Christ?" had been stirred again of late, and the answer of loyal faith had been emphatically given by the representatives of a Christendom now spreading beyond the empire, in accordance with profound convictions inherited from the first recipients of Apostolic "outlines" of truth. A great innovating theory, which represented the Head of the Church as the highest of creatures, as a sort of superior and unique Archangel—a theory commanding several resources which older heresies had not possessed; appealing impressively to minds of differing types, offering to link Christianity with philosophies of the day, pointing to men of high position and ability as its supporters; eminently versatile in its forms of self-expression, and skilful in veiling, on occasion, under reverential language its own intense destructiveness, and the momentousness, for religious thought and life, of the issues which it involved;—this theory had pushed itself forward, by various advocates, in various countries, had produced a dissension among Christians which nothing but an Œcumenical Council had seemed competent to abate, and had in that Council

been resolutely met, elaborately cross-questioned, and solemnly disowned. And in the majestic formulary which that great assembly had put forth, compiled for the most part from older confessions, with the addition of one or two technical phrases which were deemed necessary to check evasion and to guard the true sense of simple language, the fundamental Monotheistic principle underlying all revelation was practically harmonized with the two specially Christian propositions which affirmed the reality of our Lord's Sonship and of His Godhead; and the Creed which excluded all heathenish multiplications of Deity enforced on the Christian soul the infinite claims of a truly divine and eternal Christ. Such was the doctrinal result of those two months at Nicæa. And thus it is easy to imagine the sense of relief and satisfaction which would gladden the journey of many a prelate, from Bithynia, to his own distant church, in those autumnal weeks of 325, and the thankfulness with which many a flock, in Italy or in Syria, in Greece, or Egypt, or "ever orthodox Gaul," would receive their pastor's account of the synodical definition which had vindicated the Redeemer's majesty. The beautiful tradition of the Armenian Church represents its "Illuminator" Gregory as welcoming, at Valarshabad, his son Aristaces, who had represented him at the Council, and breaking forth, after he had heard the Nicene Creed from his son's lips, into the doxology which, to this day, is recited after the Creed by the celebrant of the Armenian liturgy: "Yea, we glorify Him who was before the ages, by adoring the Holy Trinity and the One Godhead of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, now and ever, through ages and ages. Amen."

And yet to us, knowing what we know of the post-Nicene history, this serene hopefulness must needs be pathetic. It looks too like the unthinking joy of children, sure to be chastened by the oncoming experience of life. The halcyon days were soon to be overclouded. By degrees, and not by very slow degrees, Christians had to learn something more of the limitations under which the work of the "Kingdom" is carried on in a world subject to vanity. Grievous anxiety, bewildering perplexity, dark alarms as to the result, were to thicken around the path of believers in a really divine Christ. The issue which had seemed so clear ere long became obscured—"entangled," as Canon Scott Holland has said, in "compromises and circumlocutions and misdirections," turned aside by "complications from external influences," by the weaknesses or blunders of "normal ecclesiastical authorities" which

"temporised," or yielded, or shirked the question by "ambiguous formulas," and put stumbling-blocks in the way of the simple, and tempted the timorous to think that the Nicene Council had met in vain. But even common sense can see a providence in the concealment of trials still future. And another apparent ground of satisfaction would be found in the acquisition which the Church seemed to have secured beyond risk of loss, by the impression made on the mind of the Roman world's one ruler. Although as yet unbaptized, and not even a professed catechumen, he had now, for some years past, committed himself more and more to a Christian profession; and, after having, within a year, imperatively called for a cessation of the Arian controversy, as a vexatious wrangle over theological minutiæ between persons who were at one on the essentials of faith, had suddenly, with that rapid susceptibility of new influences which was one of his characteristics, and which might have made thoughtful Churchmen feel less secure of his adherence, adopted the most stringently hostile line towards Arius and everything connected with his heresy. Not only did Constantine, in a letter to the Alexandrian Church, describe the late "incumbent," as we might say, of the "parish" of Baucalis in Alexandria, as the sole originator, under diabolic promptings, of this impious, this pernicious misbelief, and appeal, in proof of the statement, to the "unanimous judgment of more than three hundred bishops, renowned for piety and mental acumen;" but in a general circular he likened Arius to one whose name must have suggested to all Christians of mature age whatever was most pertinacious in literary Antichristianism: he ordered the Arians to be designated as "Porphyrians," and inaugurated a tragical series of penal ordinances by denouncing immediate death to persons convicted of concealing an Arian book; but this, like other of his severe laws, was in effect *brutum fulmen*. It is probable that to this period also should be assigned the strange letter in which Constantine replied to a memorial from Arius, who had complained of the harshness with which he had been treated, of the Imperial order which had deprived him of his home. For answer, he received what Socrates calls a piece of sarcastic rhetoric: the Emperor condescended to ignoble personalities of satire against the fallen and banished heresiarch, whose picture he drew, so to speak, from recollections of his appearance in moments of painful excitement at Nicæa. Having thus indulged his taunting vein at the expense of Arius's "bloodless face and emaciated figure," his "dishevelled hair" and

restless jerking movements, Constantine challenged the "man of iron heart" to come into his presence, and maintain his own opinions; expressing withal a hope—characteristic of the extravagant self-confidence with which the unbaptized patron of the Church was wont to approach theological questions—that he, Constantine, would be able to "heal Arius of the wound which heresy had inflicted on his soul."

In regard to one of the two subordinate questions decided by the Nicene Council, the Meletian discord was healed, as far as a resolution of the Council would heal it, by measures which Athanasius, with his local knowledge of the temper of the party, did not scruple to regret as too indulgent. We have seen what these provisions were. Alexander, accordingly, on returning home carried them out in the first instance by summoning Meletius, and desiring him to make out a list of his clerical and episcopal adherents. Athanasius, who, however, writes on the subject with an evident bias, ascribes to "Pope Alexander" the intention of preventing Meletius, by this prompt action, from "selling ordination to many," and so increasing the number of his partisans. Meletius drew up the list, and placed it in the archbishop's own hands. It contained the names of twenty-nine bishops, including his own, of five presbyters, and three deacons. One of the bishops was a person whose after-conduct went far to justify Athanasius's opinion that these sectarian chiefs would abuse the Council's leniency: he was John of Memphis, whose secular name was Arcaph, and who, either then or shortly afterwards, "was ordered by the emperor to be with the archbishop," *i.e.* to remove to Alexandria and live there, as a person needing special surveillance under Alexander's immediate control. That control was not to be long exercised. The "archbishop," whose life had, ever since 319, been harassed by a controversy which, according to the most probable account, he had not provoked, and which had made him, against his own wish, "a man of strife and contention," was struck by a fatal illness not long after his return home. The "Index" to Athanasius's Festal Letters dates this event in April, 328. Now let us consult the chief authority. Athanasius, after speaking of the terms granted to the Meletians at Nicæa, says that "within five months afterwards, Alexander died." Five months from the close of the Council would fix his death about the end of January, 326; and if we understand the words of Athanasius to mean that he died five

months after those terms had become operative, still it is incredible either that he should so long delay his return from Nicæa, or that the arrangements for the reception of thirty-seven persons into Church communion should trail on for something like two years. Naturally they would be finished before the end of 325; and the death might then take place about the end of April, 326, and the "Index" may be right as to the month, though wrong as to the year. The close of his life was vexed by the discovery that Meletian factiousness was in truth irreconcilable. John Arcaph, as leader of the party, strove in vain to get the Emperor's licence for holding separate religious assemblies; but one cannot implicitly rely on the Meletian stories reported by Epiphanius, and the vague allusions of Eusebius may refer only to some Meletian address to Constantine immediately after the Nicene Council. It is possible, however, that Alexander may have found it expedient to send Athanasius, as his archdeacon and confidential agent, to Constantine's court before he was himself taken ill. It is certain that Athanasius was absent when Alexander died. For, in the first place, Apollinaris of Laodicea, whose father, the elder Apollinaris, was an Alexandrian born, not only says that Athanasius had fled, to avoid election at the approaching vacancy—a proceeding which, on the whole, may be thought unlikely on the part of one who owed so much to the old archbishop, and would hardly, of his own will, and from merely personal motives, leave him when the end seemed near—but adds the vivid and pathetic anecdote transcribed from some work of his by Sozomen, how that Alexander, when at the very point of death, called for "Athanasius," whereupon another Athanasius—probably the son of Capito, an "Athanasius, presbyter," who lived to suffer with his great namesake in the Catholic cause—answered, "Here am I;" but Alexander, as if no one had spoken, repeated the name, and then in faint dying accents murmured, "Athanasius, you think you have escaped, but you will not escape," "intimating," said Apollinaris, "that he was being called to the contest."

No such explanation, indeed, was necessary to bring out the prophetic significance of those death-bed words. It must have been clear even when they were uttered, that the next occupant of "the Evangelist's throne" would have to play the man against various enemies of the Church. And who should that occupant be but the great deacon, who had already proved himself so strong of heart and clear of aim, so quick to discern and energetic to act, so effective at Nicæa against Arian astuteness, so faithful, loyal,

and powerful a supporter to the old prelate who had cherished him as a son? Alexander could not, says Tillemont, "show more love to his Church, nor make her a richer gift, than by leaving to her Saint Athanasius in his stead;" and yet Athanasius, for whatever reason, was not at hand, *may* have delayed his return—if he had been sent on business to the court—in order, if possible, to avoid an appointment which hardly any one of the great men of the ancient Church accepted without genuine reluctance and alarm. Some delay took place, therefore; and the custom which perhaps existed at Alexandria at that period, whereby the designated successor watched the corpse of the late bishop, placed his right hand on the lifeless head, personally laid the body in its grave, then put on "the pall of Saint Mark" and took his seat on the vacant throne, could not be observed in this case. Epiphanius believed that the Meletians took advantage of the interval to set up Theonas as *their* bishop of Alexandria; and he says, by way of accounting for it, that Alexandria "had never had two bishops as the other cities had"—that is to say, there had not been in the capital of Egypt any Meletian bishop disputing the position of the Catholic, as was the case in the subordinate cities. There may have been some such attempt on their part; but when Epiphanius says that the Churchmen elected Achillas, this is a confusion with Alexander's predecessor; and we may take it as certain that after some weeks, or rather months, from the death of Alexander, the vacancy came legitimately to an end. As to the time of the election, it cannot have been before the beginning of May, 326, for Cyril of Alexandria ascribes to Athanasius a pontificate of "forty-six years complete," and Athanasius died on May 2, 373; he must therefore have come to the see after May 2, 326; and although some would date his accession at the end of that year, so long a vacancy seems improbable, and the Festal Letters' Index—which, we must recollect, is not by Athanasius himself—may be right in fixing on the 14th of Pauni, *i.e.* June 8, as the time of the election.

Two points must be noticed as to its proceedings. The bishops who owed obedience to the "successor of St. Mark" were nearly one hundred in number. They would all, if possible, meet, according to custom and the fourth Nicene canon, for the election of him who was to be at once their metropolitan and their primate. Now the Arians afterwards circulated a story, that seven of these prelates, breaking the vow which they had made, with their brethren, to give their votes in open synod, clandestinely consecrated Athanasius; nay,

worse, according to one form of the tale—that he with some followers seized the church of St. Dionysius one evening, found there two bishops, secured the door against their escape, and compelled them to lay their hands upon him, exerting some strange (one might say, mesmeric) fascination over their wills; that the other bishops anathematized Athanasius; but that he, having strengthened his own position, wrote to Constantine, as if in the name of the community of Alexandria, to announce his consecration, whereupon Constantine, deceived by the form of the letter, confirmed the appointment. But these statements may take their place at the head of a long series of Arian calumnies against the great hero of the Nicene faith. For the Egyptian prelates, in their Encyclical of A.D. 339, solemnly proclaimed to all Christians that the entire body of Alexandrian Church-people had for days and nights, during the session of the election-synod, kept up their exclamation, "Give us Athanasius, the good, the pious, the Christian,—one of the ascetics," or the self-disciplined, alluding to Athanasius's known strictness of life, modelled, as far as circumstances would permit, on the fasts and devotions of the venerated Antony. "He," they cried, "will be a bishop indeed!" They prayed aloud to Christ for this object of their desire: they declared that the bishops should not leave the church where they were sitting, until Athanasius was proclaimed as bishop-elect; and so, in their presence, not indeed with absolute unanimity—an admission which guarantees their statement—but by a majority of episcopal voices, Athanasius, as Gregory Nazianzen expresses it, "was raised to the throne of Mark in virtue of the suffrages" (that is, the earnest resolute expressions of desire, constituting morally what was otherwise called a "choice") "of the whole people, and not by those vile methods, afterwards prevalent" (he alluded, perhaps, to the case of Macedonius at Constantinople), "of violence and bloodshed, but in a manner apostolical and spiritual." The attestation of the Egyptian bishops, who refer also to the whole province as cognisant of the fact, was enough for the sardonic Gibbon, who observes that these prelates would not guarantee "a *public* falsehood." As for the suggestion that the ex-Meletian bishops were overridden in the exercise of their suffrage, it is absurd on the face of it; for the Nicene Council had allowed them no diocesan jurisdiction, and therefore no vote in episcopal appointments.

Another point to be mentioned is, that according to Eutychius, patriarch of Alexandria from 933 to 940, a thorough change in the

mode of appointing bishops of that great see was made in the case of this his greatest predecessor. His statement is that (1) of old, the patriarch was chosen by a college of twelve presbyters, tracing its origin to St. Mark, and was always one of their own number, "the rest of them laying their hands on his head, and thus blessing him and making him patriarch," but (2) Alexander ordered that future patriarchs were to be chosen by the neighbouring bishops, not by the college of presbyters, and not even necessarily out of that college. And he adds that there was no bishop outside Alexandria until the time of Demetrius. What are we to say of this statement? To begin with, Eutychius lived some six hundred years after the days of Alexander. Next, he was a writer capable of gravely retailing some most grotesque fictions as to Alexander's episcopal acts; for instance, he says that Alexander destroyed an Alexandrian idol called Michael, that he deposed his predecessor for Arianism, and that he refused to curse Arius a second time at Constantine's order; and as to Alexandrian Church history, this writer makes Origen a bishop in the sixth century! Thirdly, the story, if it implies, as it seems to do, that this presbyteral benediction was the only consecration of early Alexandrian patriarchs, is opposed to a mass of evidence as to the general mode of ancient episcopal consecration. Fourthly, some evidence of real value indicates that Egypt had many bishops in early times, although some may have been rather vicars of the Alexandrian bishop than proper diocesans. The Egyptian "Church Ordinances" mention elections of bishops; and Pamphilus spoke of Demetrius as having assembled a synod of bishops against Origen, who himself speaks of bishops in a matter-of-course way as the ordinary rulers of the Church. Lastly, Eutychius seems to have got hold of a distorted form of Jerome's story, that until the times of Heraclas and Dionysius (who came to the Alexandrian see in 231 and 247) "the Alexandrian presbyters used to nominate one of themselves to the higher dignity of the episcopate, just as the army made an imperator, or the deacons named an archdeacon." This statement, which has no support from Eusebius, does not, properly speaking, exclude, but rather suggests, some confirmation of such an act by higher authority; for on the constitutional principle it would be for the senate to ratify the election of an "imperator," and that of an archdeacon would unquestionably require the sanction of the bishop; and there would be nothing very strange if the chapter, so to speak, of Alexandrian presbyters had the sole right of

nominating their bishop, and if, as a further privilege, all persons extraneous to the chapter were disqualified for such election. And the statement is immediately followed by the words, "*For* what does a bishop do which a presbyter may not do *except ordaining?*" After all, Jerome may have been mistaken: the story is his alone: and, supposing it to be true, it is not to be confounded with the Eutychian story, as to which we may further remark, that had the election of Athanasius been thus the inauguration of a new method of appointment, in virtue of an ordinance of the late bishop, some advantage of that circumstance would have been taken by the Arianizing party.

The accession of Athanasius must have caused to all who sympathised with that party the keenest vexation and disquiet. We may perhaps suppose that either before his accession or very soon after it, complaints were made from Alexandria to Constantine of certain pertinacious Arians, whom the Emperor thereupon summoned to Nicomedia, as having endeavoured to rekindle the dissension. Eusebius welcomed them as brethren; and, in conjunction with his friend Theognis of Nicæa (who, like himself, is said by Socrates, but incredibly, to have signed the Nicene Creed without its anathemas), admitted these rejectors of that creed to Communion. Indignant at this conduct, the Emperor banished the two bishops into Gaul, and wrote to the Nicomedians a severe denunciation of Eusebius, as having "turned their minds away from the truth," by a misuse of his influence over them and their clergy; not omitting to recall the imputations—perhaps forgotten during recent events—which charged Eusebius with having lent his active support to the tyranny of Licinius, and been implicated in the murder of "bishops who deserved the name." In that age, imputations against the character of an obnoxious man were but seldom sifted with anything like judicial strictness by those who had an interest in repeating them; even Athanasius too lightly adopted the worst construction of Meletius's actions in his original quarrel with Alexandrian Church-authority, and also countenanced a discreditable suspicion as to a crypto-Arian bishop of Antioch; and much more would Constantine take up a current rumour of this kind, when he wished to aggravate the case against a powerful court-bishop who had suddenly incurred his displeasure. However there was no doubt that these Alexandrian Arians had been patronised by Eusebius and Theognis; and this "impiety, and connexion with Arian fanatics condemned by the Œcumenical

Council," was proved to the satisfaction of a local synod, which forthwith appointed Amphion to succeed Eusebius, and Chrestus to succeed Theognis—at some time, probably, in 326, for Philostorgius's date of "three months after the council" is hardly consistent with the tone of Constantine's letter, which seems to imply that some longer interval had elapsed.

A very different subject from the Arian controversy now began to attract the interest of Christians in Palestine. Helena, the Emperor's mother, now approaching her eightieth year, had come to pray at "Ælia," or Jerusalem, at a time when her heart was deeply wounded by "the untimely fate of her grandson Crispus," whose mysterious disgrace and execution, in the summer of this year, cast a dark shadow over Constantine's life. She found the city, says Socrates, "as desolate as a garden-lodge, in the words of the prophet." Her son had already, however, contemplated an exploration of the sacred ground associated with the Crucifixion and the Burial; and her presence in Jerusalem stimulated the work which he now ordered to be carried on. Thus there may be no real contradiction between Eusebius, who ascribes that work to the son, and later writers like Socrates, who give such prominence to the mother. Eusebius does in fact record her pilgrimage to Palestine, and her pious zeal for whatever could honour "the place where the Lord's feet stood;" but he is referring especially to the church-building, of which more presently, in Bethlehem and on Olivet. The object which Constantine, and, we may be sure, Helena also, had at heart, was the discovery of the Sepulchre of our Lord. The tradition of the place averred that a lofty mound of earth, the top of which was paved with stone, and surmounted by a temple of Aphrodite, would be found to cover the actual spot. "Impious men," says Eusebius, "had striven to obliterate the memory of that monument of immortality, by laboriously covering it with earth, and raising upon the mound thus constructed a true burial-place of souls," in the shape of a temple for that loathsome "cultus" which, beyond all other idolatries, would insult and defile the sacred ground beneath. There appears to have been no difficulty felt as to where the search should be made: it was believed that where the mound rose, there lay the sepulchre below it; and the statements made by Sozomen in the next century as to uncertainties existing for a time, and removed in part by the family records of a Jewish resident, do not agree with earlier language. We may assume that the account given

to Constantine was substantially the same which Alexander of Jerusalem had heard when, about 214, he came to see "the Places;" but whether this local belief was well founded depends, of course, on the question whether in the first century the site in question was enclosed by the "Second Wall," or whether, as defenders of the tradition consider, that wall sloped inwards so as to exclude the site, and with it the "place of a skull." On the latter view the tradition would be quite compatible with the assertion that "Jesus suffered without the gate" (Heb. xiii. 12). In virtue of orders from Constantine, which, perhaps, Helena herself brought, the temple was destroyed, its materials indignantly flung away, while the images which it contained were broken to pieces, the mound was levelled, and then the cave of the sepulchre came, we are told, to light, uninjured and undefaced, "attesting to all eyes," says Eusebius, the truth of the Gospel story. The Emperor, on hearing of this successful result of the excavation, wrote to Macarius, bishop of Jerusalem, expressing his delight at the discovery of the monument of "the most holy Passion," meaning clearly, the sepulchre as a standing evidence of the Death; and proceeded to announce his intention of adorning the spot with a basilica which should surpass all others in its general effect and its several details, and to request the bishop's opinion as to the best marbles to be employed, and as to whether the roof should be wrought in mosaic, or fretted and gilded—the latter of which two methods was in fact adopted with brilliant effect. Thus commenced the building of the Constantinian church, properly called the "Martyrium of the Resurrection" or "of the Saviour," sometimes, rather confusedly, of "Golgotha," afterwards "of the Holy Cross," which was not dedicated until ten years after the Council of Nicæa. Eusebius describes it as exceedingly lofty and broad, with cloisters extending along its sides: in the apse were the altar, the episcopal throne, the seats for the clergy, and twelve pillars with silver bowls by way of capitals; beyond the apse was the baptistery. These, it should be remembered, were at the *western* end of the church; the entrance was from the east, by three doors which were reached by a flight of steps from a large oblong court, open to the sky, and "paved with glittering stones." To the north of this court rose the hill traditionally named Golgotha, on which, when the Gallic bishop Arculf, as reported by Adamnan and by Bede, visited it in the seventh century, a church stood, and within it, on the supposed spot of the crucifixion, a large silver cross, with

a circle of lamps hanging above. Beyond the court eastward an elaborate work had been executed by Constantine's order: the sepulchral cave, which at first had appeared as part of a mass of rock standing out alone on level ground (as Eusebius describes it in his "Theophania"), was separated from the rock around it (which Cyril of Jerusalem calls the outer cave); it was then, with questionable taste, deprived of the appearance of a cavity, carved into the shape of a horseshoe, cased with marble, and so left to enclose what was deemed to be the actual sepulchre, both being surrounded by a building of circular form which was called the Anastasis, and was decorated, says Eusebius, in his vague way, "with exquisite columns and ornaments of every kind." Arculf, as reported by Adamnan, mentions twelve pillars, a triple wall, and within the "round monument" the sepulchre itself, seven feet long and three palms above the floor—the colour of both, says this minute observer, being white and red. A lady-pilgrim of the latter part of the fourth century, who is usually identified with Silvia of Aquitaine, the sister of the prefect Rufinus, describes an early Sunday service at which this sepulchral chapel was lighted up and filled with the freshening odour of incense.

Thus far we see from Eusebius that the discovery which Constantine's instructions brought about was supposed to be that of the Holy Sepulchre. But in 347–8, ten years after the Life of Constantine was written, Cyril of Jerusalem, then a presbyter officiating in the great church, repeatedly alluded, in his Catechetical Lectures there for the most part delivered, to the known existence and piecemeal distribution of the actual wood of the Cross of Christ. "The whole world is filled with portions of the wood of the Cross. . . . The holy wood of the Cross is seen among us to this day, and by means of those who have in faith taken of it, has from this place now almost filled the whole world," etc. The letter to Constantius, ascribed to Cyril, distinctly says that the "salutary" wood of the Cross was found in Jerusalem in the time of Constantine; but this letter is of disputed authenticity. Silvia speaks of processions to "the cross," and of tapers lighted before and behind it. But it is not until about 394 that we find, as given by Chrysostom, the first form of the famous story of the discovery of three crosses—the "holy cross" between two others, with the title attached to it; and in the next year St. Ambrose makes the same statement, adding that Helena, when the true Cross was ascertained, "worshipped, not it, but the King that had

hung thereon." Passing on but a few more years, we find this story amplified by another miracle: the "true cross" was identified, according to Sulpicius, by the revival of a corpse after touching it, when contact with the other crosses had been without result; according to Rufinus, and after him Socrates and others, by the restoration of a dying woman to health after she had touched the true Cross. But with the cross were also, Ambrose tells us, discovered the nails; from one, Helena caused a bridle-bit to be made, from the other she constructed a diadem, and gave both to her son for his use: a strange anecdote, but in its very strangeness unlike a fiction, and seemingly akin to the statement that one of the nails thus found was used to fashion rays for the head of Constantine's colossal statue on the top of the "Porphyry Pillar" in Constantinople. On the whole, the silence of Eusebius would not of itself be a proof that a cross, or what seemed to be a cross (if not three crosses), was not dug up at Jerusalem in the days of Macarius, and straightway acknowledged as an authentic relic of the Passion of Him who was there crucified between two robbers; but only that Eusebius, for his part, did not believe in their authenticity. He probably thought, as Professor Willis thinks, that these relics "were pieces of timber and iron work" which had been "accidentally turned up in the course of the excavations," and thereupon hastily invested by fervent "imagination" with a character not their own. They came to light, we may suppose, after the discovery of the Sepulchre; and some who had welcomed that discovery as true and precious might distrust the new marvel, which at the same time would impress uncritical minds more powerfully than the former event could do, for the Cross would naturally be a more thrilling and fascinating object than even the open Sepulchre; and to hear that the very "wood on which Christ bare our sins" was now in the possession of Christians would kindle an enthusiasm such as no other tidings would excite in minds which could not forecast the impulse which such a belief would give to a materialising superstition. Yet it remains that Constantine himself, and Eusebius, ignored any other discovery than that of the sacred Tomb.

Two other spots, unspeakably sacred to believers of all kinds, were enriched with memorials of Helena's devotion. The cave which, as early as the days of Justin Martyr, had been visited at Bethlehem as the scene of the Nativity, was splendidly adorned; and Constantine afterwards presented to the chapel thus formed a goodly array of gold and silver ornaments, and coloured "veils" or

curtains. On the summit of Olivet, a round church arose in honour of the Ascension; and here also many costly gifts represented the Emperor's homage to "the Great King." His mother literally executed the injunctions of that Divine King by acting as a servant to His specially devoted servants, waiting on the consecrated virgins of the Church of Jerusalem at a feast, and humbly pouring water on their hands. And not only in the Holy City, but throughout her progress in the East, this representative, so to speak, of Anna was to be seen making offerings in churches, even in "the little chapels of small towns;" while the genuineness of her piety was everywhere proved by charities at once magnificent and endearing, by exuberant benevolence for all sufferers, by the release of prisoners, the relief of persons toiling in the mines, the supply of food and clothing to the needy, the recall of exiles, the bounteous kindness to all who sought her aid—illustrations of character which give an interest to the churches bearing her name in old English towns and villages, especially in Yorkshire and Lincolnshire. She died, it would seem, about two years after her visit to Palestine, "full of peace and joy," in the arms of her son, who received her final counsels and blessings, and regarded so happy a death, in Eusebius's words, as rather "a transference and removal from an earthly to a heavenly life." He buried her body at Rome; "the tradition of the Greeks" said that after two years he removed it to his new capital at Byzantium; but this tradition Tillemont regards as questionable. Constantine was not behindhand in imitating his mother's zeal for the external building-up of the Church. In Palestine he employed a converted Jew named Joseph—who afterwards, when about seventy years old, told Epiphanius that he had been converted after repeated visions of Christ—in the work of raising churches at Tiberius, Nazareth, and other places which had been inhabited by Jews only. Hearing that Mamre, or Terebinthus, was still a favourite seat of "impure worship," where libations were poured into "Abraham's well," and each worshipper devoted his choicest animals for sacrifice, Constantine wrote to the bishops of Palestine in terms of indignant rebuke: his mother-in-law, he said, had informed him of misdoings which they had culpably overlooked. The place where God the Saviour Himself, with two angels, had appeared to Abraham, must be cleared of foul idolatry; and he had commanded Acacius, one of the "counts" who ranked highest among imperial attendants, to have the altar pulled down, the

"images" burned, and a church erected on the spot, "that it might be rendered a fit meeting-place for holy men." At Aphaca in Mount Lebanon, where a starry flame was believed to descend on a certain day into the river Adonis, he suppressed the abominations connected with the temple of Aphrodite; he provided churches for the Phœnician Heliopolis, a place infamous for exceptional grossness of heathen profligacy; he rewarded the inhabitants of Maiuma, the port of Gaza, for their unanimous adoption of Christianity, by erecting their town into "the city of Constantia:" he razed to the ground the shrine of a Cilician oracle; he caused the images which, like that at Ephesus in St. Paul's day, were said to have "fallen down from Zeus," to be "purified" and made public property, if their materials were of value, while such as could not be so utilised "were left as monuments of the baseness of pagan superstition." For this raid against idolatry he employed, instead of military force, the agency of one or two trusted confidants, who, says Eusebius, went in fearless faith among large populations, destroying the strongholds of "long-standing errors," invading the "darkest recesses" of temples, and exposing brazen images dragged forth with ropes into open day. The result of this, says Eusebius, was in some cases the conversion of pagan spectators; in others, he admits, people lost their old belief without adopting a new one. Constantine indeed, in conformity to his own farewell speech at Nicæa, in which he had reminded the bishops of the various motives which might attract men to Christianity, was careful to associate his edicts against local idolatries—edicts which, in his later years, grew more and more stringent, although they were far from being always successful—with acts of imperial munificence for relief of poverty and distress, which might lead many to feel that the destroyer of temples was at any rate their most powerful friend and patron. Among the churches which he built, and which by their size and splendour were doubtless meant to impress the popular mind with a sense of the majesty of Christianity, as well as to witness for the principle of offering the best and costliest of earth's treasures to God's service, may be mentioned a magnificent basilica, which was erected at Nicomedia "in honour of his Saviour" and in remembrance of his "victory over the enemies of God:" he began a great church at Antioch, the completion of which in his son's reign forms an epoch in Eastern Church history, so far as the Arian controversy is concerned. But far more

interesting and momentous were his three great ecclesiastical foundations in Rome itself. The oldest, which seems to have been completed under Silvester, was formed out of that "Domus Faustæ" which, as we have seen, had been used for a conciliar inquiry into the Donatists' case, and which still perpetuated the memory of its old patrician lords by the name of "Lateranum." Thus arose "the Constantinian basilica of the Saviour," afterwards called St. John Baptist's, the original "Christ Church" of Christendom, which superseded the primitive cathedral that had been formed out of the "house of Pudens" on the Viminal, and which still, in its modern form, retains its diocesan primacy, and vaunts itself, by a proud inscription on the façade, "Omnium urbis et orbis ecclesiarum mater et caput." Its site, on the south-eastern edge of Rome, contrasts with that of the more famous church built over the reputed tomb of St. Peter along the northern line of Nero's Circus on the Vatican hill, but including that of the Via Cornelia to the north of it. We may take it as a typical basilica, observing that both the Roman law courts and the old Roman churches were developed out of the great mansions of Roman nobles; the pillared court or "atrium," roofed over, became the justice-hall proper and the church-nave; its porticoes would serve as nave aisles, while the "tabulinum" or family record-room beyond it suggested, in the one case, a raised apsidal recess for the judge, in the other a sanctuary with an altar, and seats for the bishop and clergy, such as may still be seen, in stately proportion, in the desolate cathedral of Torcello near Venice. Entering from the east, the visitor passed through an oblong fore-court or "vestibulum," which opened by five doors into the nave, the central part of which was flanked on each side by two aisles; ninety-two columns, "collected," says Professor Lanciani, "from everywhere," supported the lofty roof; separated from the nave by an arch adorned with golden mosaics, a kind of transept extended slightly north and south of the aisles; last of all, to the west, the sanctuary presented to view a canopy with six pillars, under which, and reached by a double descent of steps, was the "confession" or burial-chamber of the martyred Apostle, containing a "loculus" or coffin in an outer case of bronze, with a massive golden cross on the lid. High above was the altar, surmounted by a canopy resting on porphyry pillars, with the episcopal throne and the seats of the clergy beyond. Duchesne considers the church to have been 390 feet long (its enormous successor extends lengthwise

to 607 feet) without including the apsidal sanctuary; its breadth was 226 feet; thus, to compare its proportions with those of our own two primatial churches, it was shorter than Canterbury by 126 feet, than York by 96, but 174 feet wider than the main part of York, which is a few feet wider than that of Canterbury. A fair idea of its interior may be derived from the present magnificent (though sadly lonesome) basilica of St. Paul "Without the Walls," which represents not only the comparatively small church reared by Constantine over that Apostle's tomb on the Ostian road, and appropriately endowed with property at Tarsus, but the far larger structure began by Valentinian II. and finished by Honorius, consisting of an ample transept and a vast nave. Legend said that St. Paul's body was transferred to this spot from the place of his martyrdom at Aquæ Salviæ or Tre Fontane, on a road leading out of the Ostian, by a pious lady named Lucina; but history attests the belief as to the two Apostolic graves from at least the early part of the third century, when Caius offered to show his Montanist opponent "the trophies" of the two great apostles on the Vatican and on the Ostian road. Constantine is also claimed, with some probability, as the founder of the two churches of St. Agnes and St. Laurence "Without the Walls," both rebuilt in the seventh and sixth centuries, but retaining much of their primitive aspect. The basilica of "The Holy Cross in Jerusalem" in the Sessorian palace occupied by Helena, and long afterwards by Theodoric, is ascribed to her munificence—perhaps by an assumption which belongs to the developed story of her discoveries at Jerusalem: it is called "Heleniana" in the record of a clerical and lay assembly held there in 433 to inquire into charges laid against a pope. It should be added that in Mr. J. H. Parker's opinion some of these churches were built by the clergy with grants made by Constantine. Lists of splendid and precious furniture, including lamps and altar vessels, are assigned to the Constantinian churches at Rome: St. Peter's is said to have possessed estates at Antioch and Alexandria, elsewhere in Egypt, and even in Eastern Assyria. These and the like endowments, which probably were but gradually obtained, were not drawn from the treasury, but from property confiscated during persecution, and left unclaimed by the heirs of Christian owners, from revenues of demolished temples, and from funds connected with exhibitions temporarily suppressed.

But the Emperor's heart was not in Rome. He wanted a city

of his own creation, in the ordering of which he would have a free hand, unfettered by traditions and precedents such as had stereotyped the life of the "urbs venerabilis;" and it was with the insight of true genius that he chose Byzantium, which he had besieged while it was held by Licinius, to be the seat of a new administrative and military centre. We see him in 328 personally tracing the limits of the future capital; he follows a line at some distance to the west of the old wall, and when courtiers ask, "How much farther?" he answers mysteriously, "Until He stops who is going in front of me." The work was hurried on by his impatience; and when it was, in a sense, completed, it appeared that the old Byzantine site was still to be the heart of the New Rome, containing all the chief buildings except the Forum of Constantine, which, says Professor Van Millingen in his "Byzantine Constantinople," stood just outside the chief gate of Byzantium, and the church of the Holy Apostles, with its carved dome and roof of gilded bronze, near the new Constantinian Wall. From this forum a broad "Middle street," lined with stately colonnades, led to the oblong "Place" called Augustæum in honour of Helena as Augusta, and displaying her statue on a pillar; and at one end of it, on the site of an ancient gate, stood the "golden milestone" whence distances were reckoned. On the south of the Augustæum was a senate-house attached to it, and distinct from that in the forum; on the east was the ground afterwards occupied by the glorious church of St. Sophia. A person standing in the Augustæum, and looking northwards, would thus have his back to the senate-house, on his right hand the site of the future cathedral, on his left the "baths of Zeuxippus" (an old title of Zeus), and the entrance to the imperial palace, which came to extend far to the east and west, and had behind it gardens reaching to the Propontis, now called the Sea of Marmora. Stretching beside the palace westwards was the magnificent Hippodrome which had been begun by Severus; it was nine hundred feet long and half that width, with a semicircular west end; at the other extremity was a building called the "Kathisma," whither the Emperor could ascend from the palace in order to view the races. This vast space, which contained an Egyptian obelisk, was destined to be the scene of the most characteristic incidents in Constantinopolitan history. The design of the founder was pervaded by a resolution that "his own city" should be—what "the elder Rome" stubbornly refused to be—a city of Christian faith, "clear," as Eusebius says, of old

idolatry, although the existing Byzantine temples were not destroyed, and the quasi-pagan idea of the city's "Fortune" was conspicuously recognised. Choice works of Greek art were set up in the chief public places: the three-headed serpent which had once supported the golden tripod at Delphi stood nearly in the middle of the Hippodrome, and survived to be partly shattered by Mahomet the Conqueror; the Augustæan senate-house exhibited a statue of Zeus which had come from Dodona, another of Athene, and a group of the Muses; and the idea of these "spoliations" might be illustrated by Keble's poem for the Third Sunday in Lent. So in the centre of the forum the famous Porphyry Pillar, which with its marble pedestal rose to a height of a hundred and twenty feet, was surmounted by a statue in which the head of Apollo had been superseded by that of Constantine referred to above; while the triumph of Christianity was more evidently set forth by the image of the Good Shepherd as presiding over a fountain. The vestibule of the palace impressed the same thought by means of a picture of Constantine with a cross of gold and jewels over his head, and a dragon transfixed at his feet; and its chief state apartment was ornamented by a cross of precious gems beaming from the centre of the gilded roof, and forming what Eusebius calls a visible "phylactery" of the Emperor's reign. Eusebius says that he adorned his city with "many houses of prayer;" but Socrates, whose whole life was spent in Constantinople, ascribes to him two only—that of Irene, which doubtless indicated a Pauline title of Christ as "our Peace," and that of the Apostles; but he made preparations, doubtless, for the great church of "the Holy and Eternal Wisdom," and for others finished after his death. Eusebius preserves for us an interesting letter, in which Constantine desired him to finish at the public expense, for public reading in the churches of Constantinople, fifty copies of Scripture, correctly and fairly written, on well-prepared parchment, by skilful hands, and to send them in two public conveyances, under the care of a deacon of Cæsarea. The commission was promptly executed: the transcripts, arranged in sets of three or four leaves, containing twelve or sixteen pages each, arrived at Constantinople, probably soon after the dedication of the city, which took place on the 11th of May, 330—a day kept long afterwards with a grand ceremonial, in which tapers were carried in procession round the statue of Constantine on the porphyry pillar. The history of this Christian Rome, extending through eleven centuries to the

fatal 29th of May, 1457, when the last of the Constantines died a hero's death, is mournfully overclouded by senseless factions, dynastic intrigues, brutal punishments, selfish luxuriousness, and a formal and pedantic religionism. There is no freshness of life, because no freedom; the richness of the scene has been compared to that of "tropical decay." But there is another side to the picture, to which Gibbon did but scanty justice; and one is glad, at any rate, to remember the glory of some really great Constantinopolitan reigns, the reinvigorations after periods of decadence, the preservation, as Dean Church expresses it in his matchless chapters on the "Influences of Christianity on National Character," of the "traditions of learning and scholarship," of art and culture, of commerce and industry, and the elaborate legislation and "administrative experience" which helped to make this empire, especially under the Basilian line, "the only existing image in the world of a civilised state," and better still, its persistent stand against "the barbarous tribes and Oriental peoples which" (in Van Millingen's words) "sought to make European civilisation impossible, and to strike down a great outpost of Christian faith." We ought to remember this, and withal to think of the first Constantinopolitan generation as remarkable for benevolence to the poor, and for a Christian fervour which commended the faith to many of their Jewish, and to most of their Greek neighbours.

An instance in which that faith was commended to a barbarous people by unofficial zeal is supplied by the story of a captive woman, Nina or Ninia by name, whose profound devotional earnestness impressed, in the first instance, with a sense of some unearthly power the "Iberian" or Georgian heathen among whom she dwelt. She seemed to live in prayer and fast, in vigil and thanksgiving; her bed was a sack spread on the ground. Why did she go through all this? The question was soon answered: this was "the right way of worshipping the Son of God." The Son of God? who was He? Something of an answer was given when a mother, according to the simple custom of these poor barbarians, brought her sick child from one house to another in hopes of finding some one that knew of a cure. The foreign captive at last was applied to. "I know of no medicine," she answered, "but I do know that Christ healed many—Christ the true and great God,—and I believe He will heal this child also." She laid the little one on her rough bed, prayed over it, and presently restored it to the mother: the child from that very hour

did well. A similar prayer of faith was followed by the recovery of the Iberian queen from sickness: the stranger was warmly thanked, but answered, "It is not my work, but the work of Christ, the Son of the God that made the world." The king, whose name is given as Miran, offered her a reward; she put it aside, saying, "You could best reward me by acknowledging my God." "He treasured up the saying." Next day, having lost his way, while hunting, amid a dense mist, he called first on his own gods—in vain; then appealed to the God of the foreign woman, and saw his path lying clear before him. In due time he and his wife became converts, and afterwards active preachers of Christianity. Priests were obtained from Gregory, "the Illuminator" of Armenia, or, by another account, from the Roman empire; and Georgia, as we now call it, took its place among Christian lands, and looked back with grateful reverence to its "illuminator" Nina. The story, as told by Rufinus, was learnt by him from one who had been a prince of the land, whom he calls Bacarius.

One other event may be most conveniently mentioned in this place, although it is associated by Tillemont with the year preceding the accession of Athanasius. This event is the development of Monasticism into its cœnobitic form—the first foundation of a conventual community.

What, we may ask, was the origin of Monasticism? What led Paul "the first hermit," in the reign of Valerian, to make the wilderness not only a refuge from persecution, but a chosen life-long home, where he might spend his whole life, as Jerome expresses it, in prayer and solitude? Why did the youth Antony, about 271, imitate the ascetics who had already, within his own district, adopted a certain extent of eremitic retirement, and afterwards dwelling in a tomb, then for twenty years in a deserted mountain castle, and finally in a rock-hewn cell on Mount Troica in the north-east of Egypt, lead a life so marvellous in its persistent "self-discipline," its intensities of devotion and of spiritual conflict, and in the union of severity and tenderness which filled all who approached him with blended love and awe? What was the mighty impulse which peopled the Nitrian mountain, and the Wilderness of Cells, and the yet remoter and wilder Scetis, with solitaries carrying out the same theory of life, and aiming at more and more entireness of self-mortification? Three principal forces produced this result. The purely Oriental passion for solitary religious contemplation received

a new impetus from the desire to realise, in its most thorough-going entireness, the Christian principle of self-sacrifice, to give up literally all for Christ, to emulate and perpetuate that absoluteness of devotion which in days of persecution had been the glory of the "Confessor." Antony was penetrated and enkindled by hearing the text read, "If thou wilt be perfect," etc. The common designation of the monk was the *ascetic* or spiritual self-trainer; his aim was to emancipate his whole being from all the manifold powers of "the flesh;" he would fain be in the strictest sense "Christ's soldier," and live altogether for and in the unseen. And then a third motive, which fitted in easily with the second, drove many a young Egyptian Christian, not to speak of natives of other lands, to seek spiritual safety in the cell of the ascetic; and this motive was a dread and horror of the moral pestilence which was around him in the towns, and which in many an instance had blighted and ruined those who had begun life innocently and happily—dread of the unspeakable corruption, horror of the detestable brutality, which seemed inseparable from the common life of a society radically heathenised. Fervent souls, full of the thought that salvation was the one thing needful, that perdition was the most terrific of realities, and that the Evil One had his haunt and stronghold in the "pomps" and lusts and basenesses and pollutions all around them, would be ready to rush away from what was not only sickening and revolting, but deadly to the soul's true life. "I must save my soul," would be the resolution, "and I shall almost certainly lose it, in such a 'world' as this city-world, whereon God's curse rests visibly!" Long afterwards Chrysostom admitted that if boys sent to school were sure to turn out well afterwards, he should "detest as foes to the commonwealth those who drew them into monasticism." Now it is impossible to ignore, on the one hand, the nobleness, purity, spirituality, sympathy, and moral wisdom of some of the great recluses, especially of Antony. But neither can we help seeing that the self-discipline was marred by unhealthy extravagance, by a confusion of means with ends, by a forgetfulness of moral proportion; that vehement natures, despairing too soon, showed a want of faith in the Gospel's power to leaven the lump of common life, and to "keep" loyal souls "from its evil;" and that for the average monk there were temptations haunting the "wilderness," such as spiritual pride, intolerance corresponding to ignorance, moods of weariness and disgust (afterwards called *acedia*), astounding hardness towards his relatives,

and a disposition to bitterness, or even insolence, in his dealings with the outer world—not to mention the risk of delirious imaginations produced by silence or solitude. No doubt the monastic impulse was for some select natures a reaching forth after "perfection." We may think with Dean Church that an enormous force of self-indulgence, such as that which then flooded society, could only be met by an equally disproportionate asceticism; but still we must say that it *was* disproportionate. If we are not to be unsympathizing cynics in our view of the subject, neither are we to be undiscerning sentimentalists; great saints living in the world of that day, fighting its influences on their own ground, yet praising up monasticism as the ideal Christianity, may have ignored the weak or morbid elements in a form of life which seemed more supernatural than their own. We must try to see the facts all round, to admire and revere without ceasing to discriminate, to recognise mistake where on New Testament principles it is patent; we cannot but wish that more good men had stayed at their posts, among "their friends," and thus borne testimony for Christ; we cannot but see that the ascetic ideal tended rather to lower than to raise the standard of ordinary Christian conduct, that very great mischief was done by monopolizing for monastic life such phrases as "religion" or "the service of God," and that in the Middle Ages, which, as Bryce puts it, are full of a "perpetual contradiction," men could worship ascetic saints without giving up their own ferocity and sensuality. But at any rate we may, at this period of our history, dwell rather on the practical wisdom, the genial kindliness, the sweetness and fragrance of soul, which charm us in the character of Antony, than on the eccentricities, coarsenesses, asperities, superstitions, and other such faults, which showed themselves only too quickly in monks of poorer mould who clearly had no exceptional "vocation." Nor can we doubt that such a phenomenon as his life, brought home to ordinary observation by his occasional visits to Alexandria, did contribute not a little to the argument involved, then as in all ages, in the presence of high Christian greatness, and helped many thoughtful inquirers to own the powers of the Kingdom of God.

So much on the earlier and simpler monasticism, as represented by the solitaries who lived, it may be, near each other, and could hold not infrequent intercourse, but did not live in community. The cœnobitic life was a clear departure from the primary

conception of solitary "self-training:" it must have begun gradually, as hermits drew near each other in *lauras* or settlements; but its chief founder was Pachomius, who in 325 established himself with about nine associates at Tabenne, or Tabennesus, an uninhabited village—not an island in the Nile, as some have thought—near the city of Tentyra in the northern part of Upper Egypt, which gave a theme of satire to Juvenal. He had begun the world as a pagan soldier of the tyrant Maximin, and had been drawn to Christianity in 312 by the generous kindness which some Christians had shown to himself and his comrades when prisoners of war. After he had been for some time the pupil and companion of an old hermit named Palæmon, he became convinced, it was said, by an angelic vision, that his mission was to serve men in order to reconcile them with God; and this led to the gradual formation of a society of monks living at Tabenne under his guidance. The Rule of community-life ascribed to him abounds in details which indicate a later development; but it may well represent the main principles on which he worked—a certain disciplinarian precision together with zeal for religious attainment, as when it insists that every one shall learn by heart some portion of Scripture, or, again, with vigilance against despotism on the part of superiors. The monastery—it was more properly the convent—was divided into a number of "families," each having a principal and a second in command, and inhabiting a separate abode, in which three monks occupied each cell: three or four families formed a "tribe;" the various necessary occupations were discharged in rotation by the families; and the common worship of each family was vespers, while some other offices, with the celebration of the Eucharist on Sunday and Saturday, were performed in the conventual church. Besides twelve prayers and psalms at vespers, the same number of prayers were repeated by the monks individually during the day and at night with three before dinner. The whole daily life was precisely mapped out by the Rule in regard to the scanty meals (usually about 3 p.m.), the time of sleep, the dress consisting of a sleeveless linen shirt, a sheepskin cloak, and a "cowl" (the cloak to be only laid aside at Communion), the labour—that of making mats of rushes or palm-leaves, the supply of which for each "house" was to be strictly regulated—the religious addresses, the meditations, the studies for which books wanted were to be given out by rule, the times of silence, the confessions of faults and the penances, the

provision that any one going outside the monastery shall have a companion with him, the multitudinous prohibitions, one of which forbade a monk who was not an official to extract a thorn from a brother's foot,—in short, the full routine of "self-training" as now consolidated by the principle of association. From the first settlement at Tabenne sprang eight others, all in the northern Thebaid, the principal being "the great monastery" at Pabau, where all were to meet at Easter; each of these had its superior or steward, and all acknowledged their "abbot" or "father" Pachomius as the general head of the congregation. It was perhaps in the earlier years of the society, when Pachomius had still some twenty years of life before him (he died in 348), that Athanasius, passing up the Nile on a visitation tour to the Thebaid (probably in order to control some unruly Meletians of that district), was greeted at Tabenne by a large choir of monks. But he did not see Pachomius, who, fearing that his own bishop Serapion would request the archbishop to ordain him priest, hid himself behind his brethren, and so, unobserved, had a view of Athanasius "as he stood up in the boat," and afterwards foretold that the young "Pope"—the special title of an Alexandrian bishop—had much to endure in the cause of faith. We must next see how his powers of endurance were to be tried.

CHAPTER IX.

THE FIRST TROUBLES OF ST. ATHANASIUS.

THERE is some difficulty in ascertaining the precise character and order of the events which led to the recall of the Arian leaders from their exile, and the consequent rekindling of dissension, although not, as yet, to the avowed reassertion of opinions anathematized at Nicæa. The account of Socrates is, first, that Eusebius and Theognis, shortly after their banishment, presented to "the principal bishops" a "palinode" or letter of submission, in which they professed their entire acceptance of the Nicene faith, and their readiness to subscribe the anathemas, from which, they said, they had withheld their assent in the council on the simple ground that they believed Arius to have been misrepresented, and to be innocent of heresy. "Now," they said in effect, "we are content to waive our opinion, and to acquiesce in *all* the decisions of your holy synod: if you will give us an audience, you will find us entirely conformable; and we have the more reason to claim this at your hands, since you have shown indulgence to Arius himself, and recalled him. We therefore request you to intercede with the Emperor on our behalf." Then Socrates adds, that by this "palinode" they procured their recall, and took possession of their sees, driving out the recently installed occupants: and he infers from the document, first, that at Nicæa they had signed the creed without the anathemas, whereas in his previous narrative of the Council he had made them not only decline to condemn Arius, but reject the creed on account of the Homoousion; and next, that Arius himself had been released from the sentence of exile, although not permitted to return to Alexandria—an inference which strikes him, naturally enough, as involving a difficulty; for why should Arius have met with indulgence at an earlier time than did the two bishops? In fact, Socrates's statement as to the

whole case of these men appears deficient in consistency and probability. He is certainly wrong as to the position in which they stood at the close of the Council. They had, we know from other and better evidence, given up their objections to the Homoousion, at any rate had acquiesced in the proposed formulary, and so were on terms of peace with the Council, and owed their exile to a distinct offence committed at a later period. This, in itself, leads one to suspect the genuineness of the "palinode;" or rather, to treat it as irreconcilable with Constantine's letter to the Nicomedians, and with the apparent meaning of an Alexandrian Council's Encyclical, referring to their condemnation or deposition. Again, the "palinode" implies that the Nicene fathers were still sitting in council, and might admit the memorialists "into their presence;" which was far from being the case. And not only does it ascribe the condemnation of the memorialists to the Nicene Council, but it ascribes to the same body the recall of Arius, and the favourable acceptance of his personal pleading in his own defence "as to the points on which he was accused;" which is altogether extravagant. On the whole, then, Tillemont seems to be justified in rejecting the "palinode," as inconsistent with ascertained facts, and partly also self-contradictory, for it makes the two bishops say that they had been "condemned before they were tried," and yet that they had "suggested what they thought good," and had "signed the creed;" and further, ascribes to them a willingness to sign the condemnation of Arius after the Council itself (as it asserts) had treated him as cleared from the charges on which that condemnation had been based. And if the document is set aside, the statement that Arius had been recalled before Eusebius and Theognis falls with it; and we are freed from the necessity which Socrates had imposed upon himself of considering Arius to have been, in the first instance, absolved from the charge of heresy, yet restrained from visiting his old home, and to have been afterwards sent for by Constantine in order to make before him another explanation of his sentiments, as if he had not made one in presence of those ecclesiastical judges who had condemned him, by the hypothesis, on imperfect knowledge of his mind. We may therefore suppose that Eusebius and Theognis (1) did profess acquiescence in the Nicene decision, (2) were afterwards banished for fraternising with notorious Arian partisans, and (3) did by some means persuade Constantine that they had no sympathy with Arianism, and thus procure their own restoration, as persons holding *bonâ fide* orthodox Nicene faith.

Hence arose a policy very different from that of the original Arians —a policy of crypto-Arianism, according to which no overt demonstration was to be attempted against the Nicene theology, and what De Broglie calls "a courtly heresy, not striking, not popular, not likely to shock ordinary Christian minds," was to be insinuated into those minds that would be likely to feel some irritation at the party, as it would be called, that had triumphed at Nicæa, and "carried matters to extremes" which learned men like the Cæsarean Eusebius, and other eminent prelates, like some of his brethren in Palestine, could not thoroughly approve in their hearts. Now here we must distinguish between those who really aimed, from more or less distinctively Arian motives, at undermining the Nicene decision,—crypto-Arians, or Eusebians, as we may call them,—and those who would say to each other that the Council had committed itself to a somewhat one-sided line; that the term Homoousion was not necessary as a safeguard of a true belief in the divinity of the Son of God, and was even dangerous on account of the ideas which might naturally be associated with it; and, on the whole, that for the future a more "moderate" course would better serve the interest of religion. The two classes acted together, but ought not to be identified; yet to apply even to the latter of them the term "conservatives" is misleading, and suggests that Homoousion indicated a new doctrinal departure; whereas the "conservatism" of those who disliked it, or vaguely suspected its import, was a thing of phrases rather than of ideas. We must also take account of a section which would be attracted by forms of speaking which, while professing full orthodoxy of belief, favoured a vague and general conception of the subject, such as might commend itself, not indeed to mere ecclesiastical and official theologians, but to statesmen and men of the world. It is evident that the line which the powerful Court-prelate—for he soon resumed all his influence over Constantine—had thus marked out for himself, promised great things for the interests of Arianism.

His recall may perhaps be dated in 329, if not in 328. We do not positively know what step he first took; but it may be safe to follow Socrates, when he places in close connexion with the return of the two exiled Arianizing bishops a blow struck at a bishop who was hardly inferior to Athanasius in anti-Arian zeal, and excelled him in the weight and dignity derived from a longer episcopate and a more conspicuous fame. Eustathius, who had been translated from the see of Berœa in Syria to what Sozomen

calls the "apostolic throne" of Antioch, about the beginning of 325—had held a high place, if not the highest place, in the Nicene Council—and was known as an able writer, exhibiting, as the same historian tells us, great powers of thought and great beauty of language, must have been, at this time, one of the most prominent men in the Church. He would have earned the animosity of all Arianizers had he done no more against Arianism than what he did in the Nicene debates; for we see the position which he then took up from a fragment, preserved by Theodoret, of a work of his against the party, in which he described the remarkable scene of the tearing up, in the Council, of an "impious document" handed in by Eusebius of Nicomedia. As bishop of Antioch, the third of the three highest prelates of Christendom, Eustathius had carried on the war against heresy by refusing to admit into the Antiochene clergy six well-known Arianizers, three of whom were destined to occupy his seat—Stephen, Leontius, Eudoxius, Eustathius of Sebaste, George of Laodicea, and Theodosius of Tripolis. He did not shrink from accusing Eusebius of Cæsarea as guilty of tampering with the Nicene faith; and Eusebius retorted by charging him with Sabellianism. These mutual denunciations lead Socrates to remark that many who branded each other as "blasphemers who denied the Son's personal subsistence," or "introducers of polytheism" in the form of worship of a secondary Deity, were really "fighting in the dark," for both parties acknowledged the Son as truly personal, and the one God in Three Persons—that is, each party was essentially orthodox in the point on which it was suspected by the other. But this will hardly pass. That among many who disputed about the term Homoousion there were some whose differences could have been removed by candid and patient explanations—such as those which, at a memorable Alexandrian Council, held some thirty years later under the presidency of Athanasius, were interchanged between Catholics who put diverse senses on the word "Hypostasis" —is indeed very probable. But it would be difficult to think that any such process could have identified the belief of Eustathius with the belief of the two Eusebii. For we cannot credit the old friend of Arius, who was cognisant of the "Thalia," with a real belief in the Church doctrine of the Holy Trinity; and we can hardly look upon the historian-prelate, whose name has been less closely linked to that of Arius, as a consistent believer in the Co-equality of the Son. These two namesakes, accordingly, now appear united against the bishop of Antioch. The Nicomedian Eusebius, with Theognis,

had obtained the Emperor's leave to visit the holy ground at Jerusalem, and the monuments of Imperial piety there rising up. On their way, they reached Antioch, where Eustathius, Theodoret tells us, "showed them all manner of brotherly cordiality." They passed on to Jerusalem, where a conference of Arianizers was held. Eusebius of Cæsarea was there, and Patrophilus of Scythopolis, Aetius of Lydda, Theodotus of Laodicea, with others. The result was that a council or conference of the party was organized in the very city of Eustathius, probably not without allusions to the councils held against his heretical predecessor in the preceding age. We have different accounts of the measures taken. Socrates quotes a statement by George of Laodicea, to the effect that Cyrus, the successor of Eustathius at Berœa, procured his condemnation as a Sabellian; to this statement he objects, on the ground that Cyrus himself was afterwards deposed on that very charge. He obscurely refers to another story, which Theodoret gives at length, and which, considering the unscrupulousness of the Arians, is not improbable, that a shameless woman was hired to ruin the reputation of Eustathius by a calumny, and that the judges, so-called, who had suborned her, acted on her evidence by pronouncing Eustathius deposed. In spite of reclamations from several orthodox bishops and laymen, the enemies of Eustathius persuaded Constantine of the justice of the sentence, and apparently of a moral charge as supporting it; and, according to one story, added a minor but irritating accusation, that the deposed prelate had spoken disrespectfully of Helena. The Emperor followed up the ecclesiastical decision of the case by banishing Eustathius into Thrace; and the parting words of this illustrious victim of conspiracy were well remembered at Antioch in the days of St. Chrysostom, who describes him as exhorting his people not to "abandon the fold," to be steady in resisting the "wolves" and bearing witness for the faith. This counsel was understood by Chrysostom as equivalent to a recommendation of the course which some of the Antiochene Catholics adopted, who did not break off communion with the bishops successively placed in the seat of Eustathius; while others, who acquired distinctively the name of "Eustathians," worshipped apart from the very day of his exile. The time of this expulsion of Eustathius was apparently the end of 329, or early in 330: it was "thirty years," Theodoret tells us, before the expulsion of Meletius from the same bishopric, in the beginning of 361. As to the filling up of the see, there was not a little difficulty: the Arianizing

leaders, not unnaturally, fixed on Eusebius of Cæsarea, then at Antioch, as the best man for that high post; they wrote to Constantine on the subject, and he also received letters from the great civil dignitaries, Acacius Count of the "Orient," *i.e.* the whole region subject to Antioch, and Strategius, or Musonianus, who had been sent to execute the decree of exile against Eustathius. The moment was decidedly critical: the feelings of the Arianizing and Catholic parties in Antioch were so exasperated, that, as Eusebius himself assures us, "matters came very near to bloodshed." But Eusebius himself shrunk from translation, which he deemed inconsistent with the principles of Church order; and wrote to Constantine, expressing his earnest wish to remain in the church to which he had originally been appointed. Constantine approved this desire, and wrote to him in praise of a resolution "agreeable to God and to apostolic tradition." To the Antiochenes he sent a long letter, admonishing them to study quietness and good order, and alluding to the removal of Eustathius as the "clearing out" of "filth that had marred their vessel." He also suggested to the bishops at Antioch, that they should select either George, a citizen of Arethusa, who had been ordained priest by Alexander of Alexandria, or Euphronius, a priest belonging to Cæsarea in Cappadocia. According to one account, Paulinus, bishop of Tyre, whom Eusebius held in such high admiration, was elected, and held the see for six months; but the fact of this translation has been doubted, and it may be that the immediate successor of Eustathius was Eulalius, whose tenure was very brief, and who was followed—possibly, though not probably, after a second attempt to secure Eusebius—by Euphronius, who also sat but a short time (a year and six months), and was succeeded by Flacillus. "All these bishops," says Theodoret, "were secretly tainted with Arianism; therefore the majority of the devout clergy and laity quitted the church-assemblies, and met for worship by themselves." Those who, as we have seen, adhered to the existing church-communion were at least safe from hearing any avowedly Arian teaching, and found it possible to profess Catholicism without hindrance, or rather to profess it as the acknowledged Christianity. A little before the expulsion of Eustathius, Asclepas, bishop of Gaza, had met with similar treatment; and a little after that event, Eutropius of Hadrianople, who had exasperated the Arianizing leaders by warning all who visited his city against the sophistries of the Nicomedian Eusebius, was driven from his church and home.

And now we must watch the opening scenes of the "long tragedy" of the troubles of Athanasius, remembering the emphatic summary which Hooker gives us of the general aspect of that life-long struggle, in which the "royal-hearted" hero (to adopt Cardinal Newman's comprehensive phrase) exhibited nothing but what "very well became a wise man to do and a righteous to suffer." The first two or three years of his episcopate were comparatively tranquil. His festal or Paschal letter for 329, the first of a long series intended to announce the right day for the coming Easter, contained no allusion to Church troubles, but is worth looking at as a specimen of his thoroughly practical tone as a Christian teacher: "ascetic" though he was, he admonished his people to remember that fasting, in order to profit the soul, must be accompanied by moral efforts after real sanctification; with all his glowing anticipation of the great joy of the Easter festival, he insisted that this gladness should stimulate believers in the Resurrection to more absolute self-devotion and to every form of active charity. One can easily understand that he was, thus early, binding his people's hearts to himself, and realising to a great extent that picture which Gregory Nazianzen afterwards drew of his episcopal character as uniting such varied excellences, "gentleness without weakness, gravity in rebuke without asperity, vigour in general administration and assiduity in spiritual duties, a comprehensive grasp of his work as a whole and a discriminating attention to special cases;" he would already, we cannot but doubt, be at once luminous and profound as a preacher, winning affection by geniality and tenderness, "stooping to the level of average minds, while soaring above the ablest in range of thought,"—making himself, in short, in the Pauline sense, "all things to all men." But he soon found that the clouds from different quarters were gathering into a storm over his head. His Paschal letter for 330 has an allusion to "heretics," as instruments of the great deceiver of souls; and it was, perhaps, about the close of that year that the heresiarch whom he had for years withstood was permitted to regain the position from which Constantine's sentence of exile had dislodged him. According to the received story, an Arian priest had gradually acquired influence over the mind of the Emperor's sister Constantia; and she, when sinking under a fatal illness, recommended him earnestly to her brother's regard. Thus introduced to Constantine, the priest found it easy to suggest to the Emperor that Arius had, in fact, been misunderstood; that there was no real difference

between his actual belief and the Nicene doctrine; that if he were allowed an opportunity, he would himself satisfy the Emperor on this head. "If this be so," said Constantine, "I will admit him to an audience, and on his professing to hold the true faith, I will restore him to his home in Alexandria." And Socrates proceeds to exhibit a letter in which Constantine expresses to Arius his surprise that he has not already come to court, since he had been for some time aware of the Emperor's readiness to receive him: language, says Socrates, implying that Constantine had already exhorted him to retract his errors. The letter contained a command to Arius to appear in the Imperial presence, in order that, "having experienced the Emperor's good will, he may return to his own country." The date of this letter is November 25, "in 330," says Tillemont, "as far as we can judge;" and Arius, with his friend Euzoius, whom Alexander had deposed from the diaconate, hastened to Constantinople, and professed their agreement with the faith of Nicæa. Thereupon Constantine, according to the narrative, required of them a written statement of belief; and they presented what has been reckoned the "second Arian creed" (the first being that statement which Arius had long before sent to Alexander). This document, although it did not contain the Homoousion, acknowledged the Son to be "God the Word," and concluded by a solemn imprecation, "If we do not truly believe in the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as the whole Catholic Church and the Holy Scriptures teach, God is our Judge, both now, and in the judgment to come," and a request, significantly though indirectly referring to Constantine's former letter to Alexander and Arius, that the Emperor would promote the writers' reunion to their mother the Church, "all needless and superfluous questionings being laid aside." This profession of belief, while it failed to satisfy the thoroughgoing Arians, who thought it disingenuous and evasive, was well calculated to serve its immediate purpose by the very vagueness of its language, which at least admitted of an orthodox sense: and Socrates tells us that "Arius, having thus satisfied the Emperor, returned to Alexandria; but the device framed for suppressing the truth did not for all that succeed: for Athanasius, instead of receiving him, turned away from him with abhorrence, whereupon he endeavoured to excite a fresh disturbance in Alexandria by disseminating his heresy." And, in fact, we find Athanasius, in his festal letter written at the beginning of 331, referring to the renewed hostility of heretics, and to the false

accusations now directed against him. Probably the first of a long series of calumnies was an attack on the canonical regularity of his election; and for this the Arianizers would find willing allies in the Meletian party, now again organized as a schismatical faction by John Arcaph, to whom, it was said, Meletius on his death-bed had bequeathed his leadership. Some movements of sectarian hostility had been met, if we are to accept the statement of Epiphanius, by an appeal on Athanasius's part to the civil power; and at all events, the Meletians were in a temper to co-operate with Arian intriguers, as having a common enemy in the archbishop. He himself assures us that Eusebius secured their aid by ample promises, and that they agreed to help him whenever he might call on them for their support; and Eusebius appears to have, in the next place, written to Athanasius, requesting him to admit Arius and his friends to communion at Alexandria. The bearer of this letter was also charged with an oral message, in which the language of request was exchanged for that of menace. But neither kind of appeal was likely to avail with Athanasius. "I refused," he himself says in his "Apology against the Arians," "declaring that it was not right to admit to communion those who had invented a heresy contrary to the truth, and had been condemned by the Œcumenical Council." Thereupon Eusebius appears to have asked Constantine, in effect, whether his gracious act in favour of a much-injured priest, whose opinions had been misconstrued by partisan bitterness, was to be practically nullified at the will of one self-opinionated prelate. It was easy to stir up the jealousy of an autocrat who deemed himself the special favourite of Heaven, and "bishop for the Church's external affairs." He sent to Alexandria two palace-officers, Syncletius and Gaudentius, with a letter couched in these imperious terms: "You are now informed of my will that all who wish to enter the Church shall have full liberty to do so. If you hinder such entrance on the part of any persons, I will instantly send a person to depose you by my command, and remove you from your place." Athanasius replied by a letter in which he insisted that "there could be no communion between the Catholic Church and the heresy that was fighting against Christ," for in that light he habitually regarded Arianism. The Meletians were now called upon by Eusebius for definite aid against Athanasius, and after some time they concocted what he treats as the first formal charge which he had to encounter;—three Meletian bishops, whose names appear

in Meletius's catalogue of his supporters,—Ision, Eudæmon, and Callinicus,—repaired to the court of Constantine, and accused Athanasius of having assumed the powers of government by taxing Egypt to provide linen garments called *sticharia*, probably resembling albs, and for use in church service—for otherwise why should the bishop be charged with this exaction? But two of Athanasius's priests, who happened to be on the spot, at once refuted this accusation: the Emperor wrote to Athanasius, reprobating the conduct of his accusers, and summoning him to court. He obeyed the summons, and found his foes ready with another and graver charge: "Athanasius," they affirmed, "had sent a boxful of gold to Philumenus," a rebel against the Emperor of whom nothing else is known. At Psammathia, a suburb of Nicomedia, Constantine examined this accusation, and found it baseless; and Athanasius gave some account of these troubles in his festal letter for 332, written somewhat later than was usual, and while he was still at the court, and was suffering from an attack of illness. His enemies, so he wrote, had been "driven away in disgrace for their wanton attack upon him;" and he blends the expression of his personal triumph with the exhortations to prepare for Easter rejoicing. The Emperor, in parting from Athanasius, charged him with a letter to the Alexandrian Churchmen denouncing the restless intriguers against their "most reverend bishop." But in this same inquiry at Psammathia, the Emperor had heard and dealt with another charge which was afterwards revived and widely spread, and which Athanasius represents as having become formidable after his return from the court. This was the famous story of the Broken Chalice. We must recall the case of the Alexandrian priest Colluthus, who had separated from the communion of Alexander in the early days of the Arian controversy, on the pretext that the archbishop was too indecisive in his action against heresy. One of those whom he had pretended to ordain, and whom the Council of Alexandria had pronounced to be mere laics, was named Ischyras: he persisted, despite this decision, in officiating as a priest, at a small place called "The Peace of Secontarurus," belonging to the district of the Mareotis, which was so near to Alexandria as not even to require a "chorepiscopus," still less to form a diocese in itself, but in which every large village had its own presbyter. In this little hamlet there was no church; but for the purpose of his unauthorised ministrations Ischyras had obtained the use of a small house,

belonging to an orphan boy named Ision, the scanty congregation being chiefly composed of the nearest relations of the so-called pastor. Athanasius, on one of his visitation tours, was informed of these irregularities, and sent one of his priests, named Macarius, to summon Ischyras before him. Macarius, accompanied by the legitimate pastor of the district to which the hamlet belonged, went to Ischyras's dwelling, and found that he was ill in bed. The summons, therefore, was transmitted to him through his father; and Ischyras, on recovering, found that his relatives would no longer countenance his ministry. He thereupon joined the Meletians, who had previously been without any supporters in the Mareotis; and they, as it appears, partly by persuasion, partly by threats, and even by violence, induced him to say that Macarius had found him in church, and in the act of celebrating the Eucharist: that while he was "offering the oblations," Macarius had rushed upon him, thrown down the holy table, burned the service-books, and even broken the chalice itself. For this violence Athanasius himself was held responsible; but it was easy for him to prove (1) that there was no church in the hamlet; (2) that the day of Macarius's visit was a common weekday, on which, according to the usage of the Egyptian Church, there would have been no celebration; (3) that even had it been otherwise, Ischyras was too ill, on that day, to leave his bed; (4) finally, that no celebration by him could have been valid in the eye of the Church, for he was not a priest at all, his ordination having been pronounced null and void on account of the essential incompetency of his ordainer. Ischyras, who was a weak unstable person, was blamed by his friends for lending himself to a gross misrepresentation; and came to Athanasius, entreating with tears to be received again into the Church. Athanasius rebuked him sternly, and exacted from him a written declaration, signed in the presence of six priests and seven deacons, to the effect that he had uttered these falsehoods under pressure of actual ill-usage, inflicted specially by three Meletians, whom he named. "I take God to witness," wrote the unhappy man, "that no breaking of a chalice, no overturning of a holy table, took place." In spite of this declaration, the story was reiterated even before Constantine, who, as we have seen, had heard enough already to reject it. And at the same time the plotters had matured a still more malignant conspiracy, which ascribed to Athanasius the combined guilt of murder and magic. We pass from the libel of the Broken Chalice to the libel of the Dead Man's Hand.

The story which is connected with the name of Arsenius is characteristic of the men and of the time. John Arcaph had raised a person of this name to the episcopate for the Meletian flock at Hypsele in the Thebaid, and had afterwards induced him to go into hiding. Then the rumour spread, "Arsenius has been murdered." Why, and by whom? The answer was ready—"Athanasius got hold of him, killed him, and dismembered his body for magical purposes: a sorcerer can do much with a dead man's hand!—and here," said the Meletians who told this hideous tale, "here, in this wooden box, is all that we can recover of Arsenius,—his hand, which Athanasius has used for his dark incantations, and which"—they did not explain how—"has come into our keeping." We must remember in order to understand the case, how imperfectly, in one sense, had Christian belief emancipated the soul from the bondage of dark terrors; how intense at that time, and long afterwards, was the belief in the occult craft of the *maleficus*, a craft of which, it is said, more than eighty kinds were enumerated: the particular form here imputed to Athanasius had been practised, says Eusebius, by the Emperor Valerian under the instruction of an Egyptian magician; and Socrates tells us that more than twenty years after the Nicene Council, the process of clearing out an underground pagan sanctuary in Alexandria for the erection of a church revealed the skulls of persons who had been put to death for the purpose of divination by their intestines. Thus to many minds it seemed simply natural that the power displayed by a dreaded and hated enemy should be due to a source not less terrible than abominable. And as Constantine by a law of 321—to which Eusebius alludes in his "Life"—had denounced the severest penalties against any who should be proved to have employed magical arts for injurious ends, Athanasius soon found that the contempt with which at first he treated this new slander would not be sufficient to clear him in the Emperor's eyes. He received from Dalmatius, Constantine's half-brother, for whom had been revived the dormant title of Censor, and whose son, the younger Dalmatius, was raised to the higher dignity of Cæsar, a formal summons to meet this charge at Antioch; and, having ascertained that the Emperor was really "moved" on the subject, he wrote, while on a tour in Pentapolis, to the Egyptian bishops, desiring that Arsenius should be sought out, and sent a deacon to carry on the inquiry. A deacon was, as such, the aide-de-camp of his bishop, ready to receive his orders or go on his errands; and this agent went straight to the Thebaid, Arsenius's

country, and learnt that the missing man had been heard of as concealed in a monastery at Ptemencyrcis, on the eastern bank of the Nile. Thither he proceeded, but warning had been given of his approach; and on arriving, he found that Pinnes, the superior, had already sent Arsenius away. However, he could at any rate arrest Pinnes, and by aid of some police-force bring him before one of the military commanders stationed at Alexandria; in whose formidable presence the truth came out, and Athanasius gives us, in his "Apology," a letter written by Pinnes to John Arcaph, which was clearly intercepted by his agents, and in which Pinnes informed his "brother and father" that it was "impossible any longer to keep secret the fact that Arsenius was alive, and had been hidden." But where was he? The search for him in Egypt was in vain; but a new scene of this strange drama, in which the comic is mingled with the tragic, opens at Tyre. In a tavern of that city are seated the servants of Archelaus, a distinguished resident, of "Consular" rank. They hear it casually said by some other customer, that Arsenius is concealed in a particular house; they mark the speaker's face, inform their master, and thus lead to a search which discovers a man evidently in hiding. "I am not Arsenius," he exclaims; but his captors insist on showing him to Paul the bishop, who knew Arsenius of old. Further denial is impossible; and Constantine is informed of the detection of the plot. He at once stops the proceedings of the Censor's court, and commands the Eusebians, who, says Athanasius, were coming into the Orient—in effect, to Antioch—for the purpose of supporting the prosecution, to return home; and he also writes again to "Pope Athanasius," with expressions of cordial respect, desiring him to "read the letter frequently in public, in order that the Meletians may be forewarned of his intention to visit any future conspiracies by personal cognisance according to the civil laws." Other letters flow in to Athanasius, expressing sympathy and congratulation; one, from a highly respected bishop, Alexander of Thessalonica, who addresses Athanasius, evidently on the ground of seniority, as his "brother and son," is preserved as a specimen of the rest. And, as if to complete the triumph, John Arcaph himself appears in church, confesses his misconduct, is pardoned, and announces to Constantine that he is reconciled to Athanasius; and the Emperor replies in a tone strangely courteous, which in itself proves that John had been formidable as an enemy. Arsenius himself wrote, in his own name and in that of his clergy, to assure Athanasius

that he and they were resolved for the future to pay all due obedience to the metropolitical church of Alexandria, and expressed a hope that Athanasius might "be strong in the Lord for many years."

These events happened about the end of 332. Incredible as it might seem, Eusebius was able ere long to persuade Constantine that the recent cases ought to be regularly examined by a council; and accordingly a council was summoned to meet at his namesake's city of Cæsarea in 333. It did not, however, meet until 334; and Athanasius, for "thirty months," as Sozomen tells us, persisted in refusing to attend an assembly from which he could expect no justice. At length, in 335, he was peremptorily ordered by Constantine to appear at a council which was to be holden at Tyre, preparatory to the solemn dedication of the newly finished Church of the Resurrection at Jerusalem.

To Tyre, accordingly, in the summer of that year, Athanasius went with about fifty of his suffragans. Their impetuous Egyptian temperament, already stirred with wrath against the persistent enemies of their chief, blazed out uncontrolled when they found themselves ushered into the assembly, not, as was the decorous usage, by attendant deacons, but by the civil officers who had to register indictments at law—when they saw Macarius dragged in chains before the Council, and Ischyras himself among the accusers, and Flacillus in the president's seat, and various bishops, known for their animosity to Athanasius, among the judges of the cause. Protests against such unfairness were in vain. The aged Potammon, bishop of Heraclea Superior, who had sat in the Nicene Council, and been honoured there for having lost an eye in the great persecution, could not restrain himself, and passionately addressed Eusebius of Cæsarea. "What, are *you* sitting there to judge Athanasius? You and I were both imprisoned in the cause of Christ: how you escaped uninjured, you best know." Here we observe that Potammon, confessor as he was, had not learned the lesson of thinking the best rather than the worst: as Bishop Lightfoot says, "a thousand things might have occurred to earn for Eusebius an exceptional favour" involving no unfaithfulness to convictions; and one cannot wonder that he commented on the "insolence" of the Egyptian. Paphnutius, that other venerable confessor who had spoken at Nicæa against the project of separating the married clergy from their wives, took hold of Maximus, bishop of Jerusalem, led him aside, and convinced him, by a few earnest

words, of the innocence of Athanasius. The accusations began: they did not touch the point of doctrine, but impugned merely the conduct of the archbishop of Alexandria; beside the former charges as to Ischyras and Arsenius, he was said to have gained his see uncanonically; to have thrown down a chair decked with linen (the covering which was usually employed for an episcopal seat); to have caused Ischyras to be imprisoned on a charge of pelting the Emperor's statues; to have deprived the Meletian bishop Callinicus, imprisoned him, and exposed him to military ill-usage; to have placed in his see a priest who had been degraded; to have beaten or imprisoned five other Meletian prelates for disowning him; and, by one account, to have been guilty of immorality. This last charge, if really made, was signally confounded; others were also promptly met; in regard to others Athanasius demanded time. But he had the pain of seeing some old supporters come forward to incriminate him; some convicted libellers found a ready hearing, while his suffragans were not allowed to speak. The scene by which this unrighteous council is best remembered is that which followed on the production, once again, of the dead hand in the little box. A cry of horror and pity broke forth, even in the town where the story of the murder had been, as one might think, disposed of once for all. Athanasius looked calmly round; he had been prepared even for this. "Does any one here," he asked, "know Arsenius?" "We *did* know him right well," cried many voices. He turned aside for a moment, and led forward a man closely muffled, with head bent down. "Raise your head," said Athanasius. The man obeyed. "Is not this the face of Arsenius?" He then lifted off the cloak, first from one hand—then, after a pause, from the other; and asked triumphantly, "Has God given to any man more hands than two?" There *was* one moment of triumph: Arcaph, who had repaid the indulgence shown to him by resuming his place among the plotters, ran hastily out of court; but others, with a promptness almost admirable, extemporised a theory of the phenomenon. "It was not really Arsenius in flesh and blood; it was an optical illusion—only one more proof of Athanasius's singular proficiency in the black art;" and this produced a new storm, which actually imperilled his life until the Count Dionysius, appointed to "keep order" in the assembly, saved it by hurrying him on shipboard. Afterwards the Eusebians admitted their mistake about the supposed death of Arsenius: a bishop, acting under order from Athanasius (always

the arch-villain of the drama), had beaten Arsenius and shut him up; he had escaped, but had disappeared: how natural, then, to think that he was dead! There remained the case of the Broken Chalice. Athanasius, by producing Meletius's list of adherents (given in to his predecessor), proved that Ischyras had not been among them; and, in fact, Ischyras was obliged to acknowledge that his congregation consisted of only seven persons. It was then that the adversaries proposed that the Council should send a commission of inquiry into Egypt, to collect information in the Mareotic district itself. Athanasius was ready with his objections: it would be a mere waste of time—they had already brought forward all that they thought they could urge, and now, being at a loss, they pretended to want more evidence. "At any rate," he urged, "if there is to be a commission, let it be composed of persons not suspected of intriguing against me." The Count Dionysius supported this plea; the commissioners, he said, ought to be chosen by open voting in full synod. But he was disregarded, for the Eusebians had taken the measure of his resolution, which had no backbone of force. Two Meletians, then at Tyre, were sent as "avant-couriers" to prepare the ground in the Mareotis; and the Eusebians in a private "caucus" chose six of their own partisans—the very persons to whom Athanasius's "challenge" would apply—and then canvassed the other bishops, individually, for approval. Some further remonstrances were made, as by the forty-eight Egyptian bishops who had come with Athanasius to Tyre; by Alexander, bishop of Thessalonica, who, having discovered what the Eusebian policy meant, took up a manful line against it; and by Dionysius, who mildly exhorted the Eusebians to avoid the censure which would inevitably attend a patent injustice, but exhorted in vain. Men who know what they mean to do are not apt to be turned aside by a few words which are not likely to be translated into action. Nothing comes of "It is no good report that I hear." The commissioners—Theognis, Maris, Macedonius, Theodore, and two young Western prelates destined to a most unenviable notoriety, Valens of Mursa and Ursacius of Singidunum, who had studied under Arius, had been deposed from the presbyterate by Catholic bishops, and promoted to the episcopate by Arians—started for Egypt, with Ischyras as their companion "in lodging, at board, in the wine-cup." The traditions of Roman civil justice would have been shocked by the proceedings of these Christian ecclesiastics, who took care to leave Macarius at

Tyre under a guard; as to which one asks, Where was Count Dionysius?

When the inquiry opened in the Mareotis, all semblance of impartiality was cast aside. As Bishop Julius of Rome afterwards said, evidence (so called) was admitted on the part of catechumens as to what had taken place at an Eucharistic "oblation," when, by universal Church-law, they could not have been present. Incredible as it may seem, we are told that even Jews and pagans were allowed to give "information," while the testimony of Catholic presbyters was refused. Philagrius, prefect of Egypt, who had lately joined the Arians, were ready with pagan soldiers to overawe witnesses, while the commissioners prompted them by signalling; and yet even so it came out that on the day specified Ischyras had been too ill to officiate. The Alexandrian clergy drew up a formal protest to the commissioners as having refused their evidence, and violated the Scriptural rules as to a fair trial (alluding to Acts xxv. 16). The Mareotic clergy addressed the Council in a paper to the effect that Ischyras never was a presbyter and never had a church, and that the commissioners had refused to give them a hearing; and they also gave in a memorial (formally dated on the 10th of Thoth, *i.e.* September 7) to Philagrius and to two other officials, containing a brief statement of the facts about Ischyras, and concluding, "The whole (of his) story is false." The commissioners, disregarding all such protests, and supported not only by State functionaries, but by Meletians faithful to their compact with Arianizers, made up their report, effected the banishment of five Alexandrian priests, connived at some pagan brutalities towards virgins and laics, and sailed for Tyre as if their end was achieved.

Meantime Athanasius had complained to Dionysius as to the constitution of the commission, and his suffragans had demanded that the case should be sent up to the Emperor on the ground that the offences charged were matter for civil justice; and he himself, despairing of any redress at Tyre, "resolved," as Gibbon expresses it, "to make a bold and dangerous experiment, whether the throne was inaccessible to the voice of truth." Attended by five of his loyal suffragans, he took the first vessel for Constantinople, and suddenly appeared in the middle of the road where Constantine was riding eastward into his new capital. The Emperor was startled; who was this small man that dared to stand in his path? An attendant said, "It is Athanasius." To

Constantine the name suggested something like "troubling of Israel;" he had been taught to regard the bishop of Alexandria as a restless agitator; he tried to pass him by in silence. But Athanasius was not one to be passed by; he meant to be heard, and the Emperor's impressible temperament ere long acknowledged the moral dignity of one who asked for no favour, but for the right of confronting his accusers in the Imperial presence. This right Constantine felt that he could not but concede. Meanwhile those accusers were having their own way at Tyre. The Council received the Mareotic report as conclusive, and on the strength of it condemned Athanasius, but in their synodal letter grounded the decision partly on his "contumacy" in ignoring the summons to attend a council at Cæsarea, partly on his "insolent and turbulent" manner of treating the charges brought against him—passing them over as insignificant, and declining the Council's jurisdiction, and lastly, on the proofs of his guilt obtained by the commissioners in Egypt. They then acknowledged the Meletians as Churchmen (they could not do less in requital of services rendered), and adjourned to Jerusalem for the grand dedication festival. The ceremony took place in the presence of two hundred prelates on the 13th of September, a day long afterwards kept holy at Jerusalem, and still marked in the Constantinopolitan Church calendar as "the Encænia of the Resurrection." We can imagine the admiration of those who crowded to the solemnity: the persons who took part in it, approaching the basilica, passed westward through the entrance court into the lofty nave, with its double aisles and rows of vast columns, its carved and gilded roof, its walls glistening with marble of various hues, and gazed with wonder and delight at the apse with its twelve pillars, beneath which, and overhanging the altar, stretched a splendid curtain heavy with gold and jewels; while, in the eastern space outside, a cloistered court united the church to the round Chapel of the Sepulchre. Here, amid all that ecclesiastical majesty could exhibit—on ground encompassed by the most sacred associations — in an assemblage of Church dignitaries which Eusebius of Cæsarea compares to the Nicene, as including representatives of Persia, Mœsia, Macedonia, Thrace, after addresses by many episcopal orators, and a solemn celebration of the Eucharist, Arius and his friends were recognised as Catholic Christians, on the ground of the indefinite and inadequate formula which, about five years before, they had presented to Constantine. The Council made no pretence of reconsidering the

doctrinal decisions of Nicæa; the line taken was simply that Arius had been misunderstood, in consequence, as the synodal letter intimated, of misrepresentations prompted by "jealousy," and that, in fact, he and his adherents had preserved in their statement "the universally acknowledged apostolic tradition." The synodal letter was addressed to all the churches within what we may call the patriarchate of Athanasius; he, of course, was treated as a deposed bishop, and, on his part, he describes this Eusebian Council as virtually hostile to his theology as well as to his character. At any rate, while professing not to innovate in doctrine, this imposing array of bishops virtually set the Homoousion aside. One prelate, whose name will often recur as an unhappy one in our history, and who was intensely hostile to all Arianizers, had refused to attend the festival, because of the recent injustice to his friend Athanasius—this was Marcellus of Ancyra.

It was doubtless a startling shock to the prelates at Jerusalem to receive a letter from Constantine, in which, after intimating more than a suspicion that the decisions at Tyre had been dictated "by passion and not by justice," and narrating the circumstances of his interview with Athanasius, he commanded them to hasten to his court. The assembly broke up in haste; many fled homewards; but the two Eusebii, Theognis, Patrophilus, Valens, and Ursacius, at once obeyed the summons, trusting to their past experience of the power of "the last word" over Constantine. They resolved, with remarkable versatility and prudence, to drop all previous charges about linen, about gold, about Ischyras, about Arsenius, and to bring forward a fifth, which was sure to touch the Emperor on a sensitive point, to the effect that Athanasius had threatened to distress Constantinople by hindering the periodical sailing of the Alexandrian cornfleet, which had now been diverted from the Old Rome to the New. Athanasius, in amazement, asked how he, "a poor man," could cherish any such design? But the Nicomedian Eusebius, with an oath, protested that he was "a rich man and a powerful;" and when Athanasius resumed his own defence, Constantine, as if utterly weary of the long disputes about his conduct, cut him short by a sentence of banishment to Trier, or, as we commonly call it, Treves, the ancient capital of Roman Gaul and Germany, where the Emperor himself had often resided, and where his eldest son Constantine was then ruling in his name. Hither, then, we must in imagination follow Athanasius through

Germany in the winter of 335–6. Accompanied by some faithful Egyptians, to whom, as to himself, such a journey must have been no slight trial, he arrived in February, 336, at the destined place of his first exile, and received a most cordial and respectful welcome from Constantine the younger, and from Maximin the bishop. To an Egyptian the city on the Moselle seemed, as he himself says, an "extremity of the earth." It had not yet, apparently, been adorned with the great gateway which now in its decay is called "Nigra;" but eighty years before it had seen an Augustus "displaying the majesty of the empire," and forty-two years before it had become the seat of government for the Emperor's father as "Cæsar;" and if its commercial importance had not reached the point which led Ausonius to speak of it as "feeding, clothing, and arming the forces of the empire," Athanasius must have felt that, as a sojourner within its walls, he was safe from the weltering sea of barbarism, and sheltered by the power of "the Roman peace." His position, as fixed by this banishment, was a peculiar one; he was, indeed, an exile in consequence of a charge which seriously affected his loyalty, and which the impatient Emperor had not allowed him to refute; yet he seems to have sometimes thought that the sentence might have been intended to shelter him from further persecution. It was a time of rest which he greatly needed, and was by no means without its brightness and consolation; and it is interesting to think that the city which was, in this same century, to be associated with the names of Ambrose and Martin, was now a haven of refuge for Athanasius.

CHAPTER X.

FROM TREVES TO SARDICA.

We have seen how Marcellus of Ancyra had expressed his indignation at the gross injustice of the Tyrian Council, by refusing to take part in the dedication ceremony at Jerusalem. But, although he had been for more than twenty years a bishop, and a metropolitan of the "Galatian" Church—not to speak of his position as one of the Nicene Three Hundred—he had already given great offence, and sown the seed of protracted scandal and embarrassment, by his own theological language in controversy with Arianism. He had been drawn to engage in this controversy by a wish to counteract the influence of a widely circulated treatise called "the Syntagma," the author of which, Asterius of Cappadocia, was one of the older Arians, and is several times named with reprobation, as "a crafty sophist," in the writings of Athanasius. Asterius maintained that the Son of God was one of the things "made" by the beneficent will of the Father, and by His impersonal Wisdom, which was to be clearly distinguished from Christ; and that Christ was only the "power of God" in the same sense that the "locust-army" in Joel was called (in the Septuagint) His power, *i.e.* simply as God's agent and instrument. This treatise Asterius carried about with him in Syria and elsewhere, and read it at synods, seating himself, layman as he was, within the chancel among the clergy. Such boldness excited no little disgust; and Marcellus, a man of eager temperament, and impelled to attack Asterius not only as an individual heretic, but as patronised by the Eusebian leaders, plunged into the fray, and wrote a work professedly in exposition of the mysterious passage (1 Cor. xv. 28) on the future "Subjection" of the Son. In this book, which he is said to have personally placed in Constantine's own hands, he did not spare the memory of Paulinus of Tyre, who

had once, while staying with him, called Christ a "creature;" and he attacked the two Eusebii, and Narcissus, bishop of Neronias, the last of whom he represented as holding what was equivalent to Tritheism. But what were his own assertions? As far as they can be ascertained from passages quoted by a very hostile critic, Eusebius of Cæsarea, Marcellus had been driven by his anti-Arian vehemence into something very like a Sabellianizing position, which would also involve "Psilanthropism" or "Humanitarianism." Pressed by the Arian arguments from the relation of a son, as such, to a father, and from the phrase "Image of God," as applied to Christ, he took the bold course of abandoning, so to speak, the terms "Son" and "Image" to the detractors from Christ's Divine dignity. He invented a broad distinction between the Logos and the Son, whom Irenæus, faithfully interpreting the prologue of St. John's Gospel, had identified; and endeavoured to secure the eternity of the former by reducing Him in effect to what we call an attribute, while, as to the latter, he sacrificed the whole Divine significance of the title of "God's own" or "only-begotten Son," and attached to the Sonship a significance exclusively human. In other words, Marcellus, apparently, held (1) that the Logos was simply a power dwelling in God, sometimes quiescent like an unspoken thought, sometimes operative like an uttered word: a power which, in the act of creation, emerged from the Divine mind as an efficient or operative energy, but which neither then nor at any other time acquired any true personal distinctness; (2) that this Logos, by a sort of "expansion" of the Divine Unity, became temporarily related to Jesus, who, as the chosen organ for its manifestation, the man whose being was filled with its presence, was called the "Son" and "Image" of God; but from whom, in God's appointed time, the Logos would withdraw itself, and relapse by a movement of "contraction" into the bosom of Divinity. Whether these views, involving such a revolution in Christian thought, were really adopted by Marcellus, or only "put forward as matters of discussion" (a plea borrowed from Greek schools), was a point much debated by his friends and foes. Athanasius, for a time at least, hoped the best as to his orthodoxy, but afterwards, by one account, suspended fellowship with him, and by another, indicated that he had gone much too near to heresy, and, according to Newman, implicitly criticized his school in the "fourth Discourse against the Arians." Later fathers more explicitly pronounced against him, and modern writers

generally treat him as heterodox. The Eusebians, of course, denounced him indignantly: Socrates believed that the bishops assembled at Jerusalem had examined his treatise, and extorted from him a promise to burn it—a promise which he did not fulfil; but this story is inconsistent with later events, for such a submission, once made, would have settled the fact of his heterodoxy as an author. It may be that the assembly at Jerusalem did take some notice of his book; but we may follow Sozomen when he ascribes its formal condemnation to a meeting of bishops at Constantinople, held, obviously, after the banishment of Athanasius. These prelates found the charge of heresy proved; they deposed the aged metropolitan from his see, and appointed to it a priest named Basil, afterwards famous as the head of the Semi-Arians, and admitted to "unite in his person the most varied learning with the most blameless life of all" that remarkable party. This Council of Constantinople laid up in the records of that church a memorandum of the condemned tenets of Marcellus; and letters were sent to the neighbouring churches, containing extracts which, it was said, would be sufficient specimens of a book too lengthy to transcribe, and of which the heretical character would be evident. All copies of the work were to be sought for and destroyed; and (as a more legitimate method of abating its effect) Eusebius of Cæsarea was desired to answer it, and accordingly produced, first, two books "Against Marcellus," and then three books more "On the Church's Theology," in which he used language "explicitly orthodox," says Lightfoot, "against the two main theses of Arius," although in some passages, as might be expected, he exhibited a strong Subordinationism. Sozomen tells us that in their letter to Constantius requesting him to banish Marcellus, they described him as having insulted the Emperor by refusing to attend the dedication of the great church at Jerusalem. Thus, as we read in the Athanasian "History of the Arians," they caused Marcellus to be driven from his home.

We now approach the last scene in the life of the great heresiarch, from whose opinions Marcellus's language represents, to all appearance, so impetuous a recoil. Arius had been again unable, after the exile of Athanasius, to regain his position at Alexandria. He was recalled to Constantinople. Athanasius tells us that he himself was informed by the priest Macarius, then on the spot, of what next occurred. This account is as follows: Constantine asked Arius whether he "held the faith of the Catholic Church;"

Arius, who, it must be remembered, had been recently recognised at Jerusalem as holding it, said, with a solemn oath, "I do." He then presented, once more, a written statement of belief, disingenuously, as Athanasius says, evading the points which were really at issue, and employing Scriptural terms which might, of course, conceal a heretical meaning. Athanasius describes this as a protestation "that he did *not* hold the opinions for which Alexander had condemned him." But this description represents what Athanasius saw in the proceeding: it is not by any means probable that Arius referred at all to his old controversy with his former bishop. Athanasius would feel that if Arius said, "I do believe as the Church believes," he was either a convert to the Nicene faith, or a trickster of the worst kind; and thus he would speak of Arius as implicitly disclaiming, and that insincerely, his notorious misbelief. Was Arius deceitful in the business? Neander thinks that he has been unfairly blamed—that he might protest as he did honestly, in his own sense, as he understood Scripture. But his protest was in answer to the question, "Do you believe with the Church?" and Constantine would take it as indicating an acceptance of what had been affirmed at Nicæa by a sentence which no subsequent authority had set aside. And even as so understood, the final and emphatic assurance of orthodoxy given by Arius did not wholly allay the Emperor's suspicions. "You have done well to swear, *if* you really do hold the right faith; but if not—according to your oath will God judge you!" The Eusebians, as soon as Arius left the presence, attempted to bring him at once into the church of Peace, then the cathedral, which stood northward of the palace, and nearer to the creek of the Golden Horn. But the venerable bishop Alexander, who was then about ninety-eight, and had held the see of Byzantium as early as 314, firmly withstood the entrance of "the inventor of the heresy." He was but reiterating a previous refusal, for, as Socrates tells us, Eusebius of Nicomedia had menaced him with deposition by a council, if he offered any hindrance to the practical carrying-out of the decree of the Council of Jerusalem in favour of Arius. "But Alexander cared nothing for deposition when he had to deal with a plan for overthrowing the Nicene doctrine, of which," says Socrates, "he deemed himself a guardian;" and finding that even the reception of Arius by Constantine had no effect on his persistency, the Eusebians angrily broke off the conference, saying, "We brought Arius hither in

despite of your wishes, and to-morrow, in despite of your wishes, he shall communicate with us in this church." They turned away from the church-gates; and the old prelate, in sore distress, with Macarius for his only attendant, went up into the chancel, threw himself on the pavement, and in that posture with outspread hands began to pray, or, as Socrates expresses it, "he bade farewell to argument, and took refuge with God." Macarius was prostrate in prayer at his side, and heard him, as Athanasius says, asking two things: "If Arius is to be brought to Communion to-morrow, let me Thy servant depart. But if Thou wilt spare Thy Church—and I know that Thou *wilt*—look on the words of the Eusebians, and take away Arius, lest heresy may seem to enter with him into the church, and impiety be hereafter reckoned for piety." Such was the tremendous prayer of Alexander on that Saturday afternoon; and somewhat later, when Arius was walking through the forum of Constantine, and approaching the lofty pillar of porphyry, while his face, often gloomy and sometimes wild-looking, was bright with triumph, and his conversation with the friends who thronged around him had all the excitement of high spirits, he suddenly stopped short, withdrew from his companions, and in a few minutes was found dead—a violent internal disorder, accompanied with hæmorrhage, having destroyed life in a manner so fearful that it recalled the horrors of the Field of Blood. "The Eusebians, greatly confounded, buried their fellow-conspirator, while Alexander, amid the rejoicing of the Church, celebrated the Communion with piety and orthodoxy." Such was Athanasius's account of the following Sunday's proceedings; but he adds a qualifying explanation that the rejoicing was not an unchristian exultation in his death—"God forbid!"—but a recognition of what appeared to them a most unequivocal divine judgment, "a condemnation of Arianism by the Lord Himself." The Arianizers, however, had their own explanation, also a preternatural one;—the forces of magic which had been employed in the case of Arsenius had been not less successful, though exerted for a yet guiltier purpose, in the case of Arius; on which Neander remarks that magic would not have been thought of, if poisoning could have accounted for the tragedy. Others, as Sozomen candidly tells us, ascribed the death to an affection of the heart, or some such ailment, caused by joy at unexpected success. The event took place in 336; and the Churchmen of Alexandria thought the opportunity a good one for addressing Constantine

in behalf of their banished prelate. The great Antony, says Sozomen, wrote more than once to the Emperor, entreating him not to believe the Meletian libels against Athanasius. But Constantine, who seems to have made up his mind that Athanasius was incurably contentious, and that peace and order would be imperilled by his return, told Antony that the judgment of the recent Council (of Jerusalem) must be respected, and commanded the Alexandrian clergy and others to forbear their foolish intercessions in favour of a man condemned for misconduct. On the other hand, he would not tolerate the Meletian party movements, and banished John Arcaph from Alexandria.

One more scene of Eusebian violence, sanctioned by Constantine, marks the year 336. Alexander, in the August, probably, after the death of Arius, was laid on his death-bed; and in his last moments, says Socrates, recommended that his see should be filled by one of two persons. "If you want a man apt to teach, and holy in life, choose Paul, whom I ordained priest; he is young in years, but not in mind. But if"—here Sozomen's version is more trustworthy—"you prefer a man conversant with public business, fit to cope with civil rulers, take Macedonius, who has been for many years a deacon of this church." The orthodox preferred Paul, whose family came from Thessalonica, and who was in great repute for eloquence; the Arianizers favoured his rival. Ultimately, Paul was chosen, and consecrated; but speedily assailed with some false accusation, and banished by Constantine, doubtless under the influence of Eusebius, and in the interests, as the Emperor would think, of public order. This was the first of four expulsions from his bishopric, which distinguished Paul amongst several orthodox bishops who suffered, in fact, for their orthodoxy, and which likened his vicissitudes, in some sort, to those of Athanasius. In this instance, Pontus was his place of exile; and Constantine appears to have kept his see vacant, and, as in Athanasius's case, prevented any appointment of a successor. He would only go to a certain point with his Eusebian advisers. And his time was now drawing to a close; he had, in the early part of 337, some prospect of a Persian war, for which he made vigorous preparations, not forgetting religious appliances, such as a chapel-tent of embroidered linen, in which the Christian rites might be celebrated during the campaign. But the war was not destined to break out in his days: the Persian king, after some bluster about demanding the restoration of provinces ceded to the empire, thought it unwise to measure

himself in real conflict against the "ever-victorious" Emperor, who, for his part, had a far different ordeal awaiting him. Ecclesiastical history cannot dwell with any special interest on the grandiose and self-complacent progress of Constantine to the end which he reached on Whit-Sunday, May 22, 337, and probably in his sixty-fourth year. The tardy and formal admission to the full catechumenate; the death-bed request for that baptism which he had deliberately postponed until this supreme hour; the declaration, after he had received the initiatory sacrament from Eusebius, that "now at last he was in very truth blessed," that all the unbaptized—that is, all who were what he had so long been content to be—were "miserable;" the imperial purple studiously laid aside, and the arraying of his whole person, and of his very bed, in radiant "chrisom" white;—these scenes, so full of pomp, so devoid of moral beauty and true pathos, impress us with no tenderness nor reverence for the memory of a sovereign whose character, though great in some respects, and not without amiability, was never free from "repulsive" elements, and did not improve as he drew near to his end. It has been well said that the spirit of the East overwhelmed him; the Roman Augustus became Orientalised. As a so-called Christian prince, he is found grievously wanting from his lack of simplicity and single-mindedness, of religious consistency and reality: he has a certain belief in the Christian dogma, but his ineradicable egotism, his Cæsarean self-assertion, make him at best a patron of the faith, and often a dictator to the faithful. The caprice and fickleness which were among his most obvious weaknesses made him often contradict, in effect, his apparently fixed resolutions in favour of the Church; and, as if by a strange irony of fate, the autocrat who, immediately after the triumph of Catholicism at Nicæa, had been ready to persecute Arians, had subjected heretics and schismatics (with a slight exception in favour of Novatians) to burdensome civil obligations, and had afterwards proscribed heretical worship, even in private houses, by a law which produced, we are told, much insincere conformity,—this Constantine fell so absolutely under the influence of advisers bent on undermining Catholicism, as to become their instrument in schemes which he could not penetrate, and to receive baptism at the hands of a prelate whom the Nicene Council had been hardly able *not* to condemn. Great allowance, of course, must be made for his peculiar temptations, for the extraordinary and anomalous position which he held, for all difficulties that stood in the way of his becoming a Christian Cæsar in good

earnest. And even as many Christians of pure and high tone may have joined in the vehement grief which followed that imperial corpse, as it was borne under the gilded roof of his new basilica of the Apostles, to rest in a central space surrounded by twelve memorial coffins, so should we, when we think of him in comparison with Alfred or St. Louis, or even with such minor sovereigns as Ethelbert of Kent or Oswald of Northumbria, remember that less was given to him, in one sense, than to any of them; and recognise whatever in him, indicating at least occasional nobleness or worth, or some honest adoption of a great religious cause, must lead us, in the words of De Broglie, to "claim for him the justice of man, and to hope for him the mercy of God."

It is natural to think best of Constantine when comparing him with Constantius, his successor in the East, who was twenty years old at his father's death. And if that father's court and personal surroundings had not become like those of Diocletian, or even of a vulgar Asiatic despot, it would have been possible for Constantius to have grown up less tyrannic, less hard-hearted, less dependent on vile palace-favourites who well knew how to "support false accusations by secret whisperings,"—such as Eusebius his High Chamberlain, arrogant, regardless of justice, "eager to ruin" every rival, who became "intolerable in his consciousness of power over his master," and "over whom," as Ammianus says with an ironical inversion of positions, Constantius "had a good deal of influence;" or Paul the "notary," called "The Chain" from his skill in stringing together calumnies; or Mercurius the treasurer, who stole into private parties, like "a dog that wags its tail but will give a sly bite," to be a spy on unguarded talk, and whose ability in malignant suggestions gave him the nickname of "Count of the Dreams." Constantius had some virtues: he was sober, chaste, a good soldier, and not without some taste for learning, although, we are told, his rhetorical and poetical attempts were failures; and it was perhaps a sense of his own practical incapacity which showed itself not only in his absurd affectation of impassive stateliness, the stiff pose of the head, and the absence of all expression in his face, but also in the avidity for flatteries, the credulity which made him fancy that he had fought where in fact he had not been present, the excessive vacillation, the dread of assassination, the restless suspiciousness, and the implacable ferocity (born of fear) which Ammianus compares to those qualities as they existed in Dionysius of Syracuse,

or in Caligula, Domitian, or Commodus. He continued, naturally enough, the Church-policy of his father, and fell under the influence of that Arian priest who had swayed the mind of Constantine in favour of Arius. And not only did Constantius give practical confidence to the Eusebians, but he was gradually drawn to adopt the Arianizing theology; his wife and his chamberlains were instrumental for this result, but he was also impressed, it would seem, by the ability of Eusebius of Nicomedia, and the exegetical attainments of Theodore, bishop of Perinthus.

It was not, in all probability, until more than a year from Constantine's death that any change took place in the circumstances of the great exiled primate of Egypt. But on June 17, either in 337 or 338, Constantine II., the eldest of the three imperial brothers, who ruled over Gaul, Spain, and Britain, wrote from Treves to the Christians of Alexandria, announcing his purpose to restore Athanasius, "the true expositor of the adorable law of Christianity" ("law" being used here, as often elsewhere, for religion). In this announcement he thought it prudent or respectful to represent himself as merely carrying out an intention of his late father; for which we have no evidence but his word. He assumed the consent of his brother Constantius, and he took Athanasius with him to Viminacium, a town of Mœsia, on the high-road to Constantinople, where the three brothers, Constantine, Constantius, and Constans, held a meeting, and concurred in the restoration of the bishop of Alexandria. The latter went on to Constantinople, where he seems to have found Paul reinstated in the bishopric; but Macedonius took the opportunity of Athanasius's visit to urge in his presence a complaint or accusation against Paul; whatever it was, it was soon dropped, and Paul admitted Macedonius to priests' orders. After leaving Constantinople, Athanasius had a second interview with Constantius at Cæsarea in Cappadocia; as at Viminacium, he said not a word against his former persecutors, and he left the Emperor, to all appearance, with good prospects of a friendly understanding. In November the churches of Alexandria resounded with thanksgivings, and the clergy and people had the intense delight of welcoming back their bishop after his exile. Reasons have been ably urged for the earlier of the two years 337 and 338, one of which must be the year of his first return; but on the whole it may be said that probabilities incline towards the latter. Constantine II. was hardly likely to make the restoration

of Athanasius one of his first pieces of business, and to take it in hand at Treves only twenty-six days after his father's death near Constantinople. And although in his letter he only styles himself "Cæsar," whereas he became fully Emperor in September, 337, yet he might even in 338 adopt a modest style in addressing his brother's Egyptian subjects. And the Syriac version of the lost Greek of Athanasius's tenth "festal letter," written at the beginning of 338, is declared by a very eminent Syriac scholar, the late Dean Payne Smith, to imply that he was still "absent" from home—"at the ends of the earth," "separated in place from" his flock, "as it were in the wilderness," and yet practically assured that his recall would ere long be obtained, *because* to God all things were possible. One very touching passage of the letter illustrates the same point:—"O my beloved and dearest, if it is from tribulations that we must pass to comfort, we ought not to be grieved on account of vicissitudes, or frightened because the world is resisting Christ, but to treat such things as a probation."

But soon after his return, new troubles broke in upon his peace. The enemies of Athanasius bestirred themselves to lay two new charges against him before the three princes: "He had misappropriated the corn granted by the late Emperor for charitable purposes in Egypt and Libya; and the day of his return had been darkened by violence and bloodshed." Irritable and suspicious, Constantius wrote to Athanasius, assuming the truth of the former charge; but "messengers from Athanasius succeeded in refuting both." He was, however, in a weak position technically, if not morally, in regard to his having resumed his see by mere civil authority, after having been deprived of it by a council. His answer would have been that the Council of Tyre was a mere partisan assembly, which had forfeited its synodical dignity by the most flagrant injustice. At the same time, his adversaries, like those of Chrysostom long afterwards, had a point which they could press; they also went further back, so to speak, into the past, and impugned the canonical validity of his election to the see. Thus equipped with weapons of attack, they began to work for the object which, while Constantine lived, had seemed impracticable, the establishment of an Arian bishop in Athanasius's stead—the person selected being one Pistus, an excommunicated Arian, who had been consecrated by the notorious Arian bishop Secundus. This scheme appeared far from unpromising. Eusebius of Nicomedia had now attained to a height of rank and influence which multiplied his opportunities and

satisfied his ambition. The charge against Paul, which seems to have affected his moral conduct, had been revived, and he had a second time been expelled from his see, and banished to Singara in Eastern Mesopotamia, afterwards the scene of a Roman defeat, in order, manifestly, that Eusebius might be placed in that conspicuous bishopric, and thus become a natural centre of operations for the eastern prelates of his party. They now resolved to try whether it was possible to enlist aid from the Western Church, and especially the aid of the bishop of Rome, Julius I., who had come to his great place in February, 337, and become known by this time for energy and force of character. To him the Eusebians sent three envoys—Macarius, a priest, and two deacons, Martyrius and Hesychius. They were bearers of a letter, and were directed to state the case against Athanasius, and in favour of Pistus's promotion to the Alexandrian see, considered as canonically vacant. But Athanasius was on the alert; he wrote and circulated a letter which, he tells us, induced many bishops to disown Pistus with anathema; and we learn from Julius himself the effect of this step on the Arian delegates at Rome. They had exhibited to him the report of the Mareotic Commission as if decisive against Athanasius. But on hearing that presbyters of Athanasius were coming to Rome with a letter, one of their envoys, though unwell at the time, "decamped by night," rather than face the shame of an inevitable exposure. His companions, the two deacons, put a bolder face on a bad business, and stood their ground; but being unable to meet the charges brought against Pistus, they requested Julius to assemble a synod for the discussion of the case of Athanasius, and if he pleased, to preside as chief arbiter. "This," says Athanasius with quiet humour, "they did in the hope of frightening me." Julius for his part invited both parties to a council; but from Athanasius we gather that he himself was asked to select the place—Julius being pretty well assured that Rome would be the place thus selected. He also sent to Athanasius a very important piece of evidence—the report of the Mareotic Commission. Athanasius immediately laid it before a council of Egyptian bishops, who thereupon drew up, or adopted, a synodical Encyclical or circular letter, which forms the first document in the great Athanasian "Apology." It is addressed to "the bishops of the Catholic Church everywhere," and is an elaborate defence of Athanasius to the following effect. His adversaries were leagued with Arians, and animated by ferocious personal malignity; their

charges against him were libellous; the bloodshed of which they had accused him was, in fact, the execution of certain criminals by the prefect of Egypt, while Athanasius himself was still in Syria; their story of irregularities in his appointment was the very reverse of the truth; the new occupant of the see of Constantinople would do well to look to his own position. The Council of Tyre was anything rather than a regular ecclesiastical synod; its proceedings were one long mockery of justice. The story of Arsenius's murder had been triumphantly refuted, and Arsenius was actually at this very time requesting to be readmitted to communion with the Egyptian Church. Ischyras was the mere mouthpiece of a scandalous partisan calumny; the Mareotic Commission had exhibited its temper, and concluded its misdoings, by a disgraceful alliance with the pagans of Alexandria; and documents were extant which proved the inconsistency and the falsity of the statements made against Athanasius. The Encyclical ended by calling on all bishops to disbelieve the Eusebian slanders, and to understand that all signatures purporting to be those of Egyptian bishops, in support of these slanders or of the Eusebian party, were in fact the signatures of adherents of the Meletian schism.

So stood matters at the end of 339 or the beginning of 340 (according to the chronology which has here been adopted); but in the Lent of 340 an edict of the prefect of Egypt astonished the Alexandrians by announcing that a new bishop was coming to take possession. This was not Pistus (he had been thrown over), but a Cappadocian named Gregory, sent from the court to supersede Athanasius, in accordance with a resolution passed by a recent synod held at Antioch. Then followed indignant outcries, protests before the magistrates that this new attack was prompted by partisan hatred, and gatherings of excited people in the churches in order to pray for the averting of a great calamity. According to the literal sense of the earliest authority, the order of events was as follows. By way of preparing for Gregory's arrival, and intimidating those who had remonstrated against his appointment, the prefect Philagrius attacked the church called after Quirinus, and encouraged the pagan rabble and a crowd of rough peasants (many of whom would have their own grudges against Christianity) to set fire to the baptistery and the church books, to ill-treat monks, to bind and drag about some widows and virgins, to offer birds and pine-cones to their idols on the holy table itself, perhaps to

throw the consecrated elements on the floor, and to profane the sanctuary by scandalous orgies. Towards the end of Lent Gregory arrived, escorted not by clergy, but by soldiers, as the bishop recognised by the State. He brought with him as his secretary an Arian named Ammon, who had been excommunicated by Alexander. He seems to have persuaded himself that he must allow rough work to be done in his cause; and he was at least indirectly concerned in giving to pagans and Jews a free hand for plundering the church, seizing on monies deposited there, and appropriating to their own use the stores of wine and oil, and even the doors, and the wood of the chancel-screen. Fresh outrages were committed on persons and property; the allowance of bread for the minor clerics and the virgins was intercepted; on Good Friday itself, March 28, Philagrius scourged thirty-four women, one of whom held her psalter in her hands during the brutal infliction; and on Easter Day, to the special satisfaction of the pagans, Catholics were imprisoned for disowning the intrusive bishop, and thereby, as it would be represented, disparaging the imperial authority. After this, Athanasius, who had hitherto remained within the precincts of a church not yet attacked or desecrated, thought it time to withdraw, by way of preventing further outrages, into a place of security, where he composed an Encyclical letter. But a reign of terror set in; Catholics were disturbed in their prayers at home by domiciliary visits of soldiers; priests were hindered from administering baptism and visiting the sick; captains of vessels were compelled under torture to take charge of Gregory's letters to other Arian bishops; and a memorial signed by pagans and Arians, imputing capital crimes to Athanasius, was placed in Philagrius's willing hands for transmission to the Emperor. Such is the account given in our chief document, the Encyclical. The "History of the Arians," which seems to have been composed in part by a secretary or friend of Athanasius without the advantage of his continuous supervision, describes him quite mistakenly as leaving Egypt at the mere report of the enormities attendant on Gregory's arrival; and the Index to his Festal Letters goes yet further astray, by making him flee from Alexandria four days before that arrival took place. Accepting, then, his Encyclical as of primary authority, we must say that, after finishing and despatching it, Athanasius contrived to get on shipboard and to sail for Rome. That he made but one visit to Rome at this time—

instead of two, as Socrates imagined—is now admitted on all hands; but the year is still a matter of dispute. However, the thirteenth of his Festal Letters, written from Rome early in 341, seems to date his arrival at latest in the spring of 340; and the question between 339 and 340 runs up, evidently, into the question whether his return from Treves was in 337 or 338, as to which we have adopted the later date. His "one care on reaching Rome," he says with a certain fine simplicity, was "to lay his case before the Church: afterwards he spent his time in attending the services." Most impressive would be the sight of the great Confessor visiting, for instance, the church of St. Peter, which absorbed the whole attention of one of his companions, the Egyptian monk Ammonius. He, we are told, would not visit any other building in the city: his austere unworldliness, perhaps, regarded its secular magnificence as undeserving of a Christian's notice; but the other attendant monk, Isidore, was for some reason at home in the high patrician society. The presence of these two men, combined with Athanasius's own enthusiasm for the character of Antony—on which, no doubt, he would dilate—and for other types of ascetic sanctity, had an important result on the Christianity of the West. It appears that he was a welcome guest in a patrician house on the Aventine, the home of a high-born widow named Albina, whose little daughter, Marcella, hung on the lips of the exiled bishop, who now "brought into that stagnant atmosphere" of Roman society "the breath of a larger world." Jerome says that she heard from him about "the purpose of monks," as illustrated by the lives of Antony and Pachomius, and of virgins and widows. Many a prejudice cherished by Roman Christians against the name, the garb, the life of a monk, would be abated during Athanasius's sojourn in Rome; and he unquestionably inaugurated, by that sojourn, the great movements of European monasticism, and prepared the way for the work of Benedict.

It would appear that Julius, after welcoming his guest, sent two presbyters, Elpidius and Philoxenus, to repeat his invitation to the Eusebians, and to arrange for a council to be held at Rome in the December of that year. The Eusebians were perplexed by finding that Athanasius was already at Rome; and they could well surmise that a council held there would not be so easily turned to their purposes as one at Tyre or at Antioch. Wishing, perhaps, to put off a decision, and see what time could do for their object, they detained the Roman envoys beyond the month named

by Julius, *i.e.* until January, 341. Elpidius and Philoxenus were therefore, in all probability, better informed on Eastern Church events than any other Roman presbyters had been in their time. They would probably hear much of the death of Eusebius of Cæsarea, which happened in 340: they might know enough of his public conduct, of those "acts" in support of Arianizing interests, which Newman considers to be his real "confession" of belief, although they can partly be referred to anti-Sabellian sensitiveness of anti-Alexandrian prejudice, and he never, at any rate, accepted Arianism in its entirety; but they would be told how greatly he excelled in learning all other prelates, how earnestly he had studied and laboured, how much he had been respected and loved by Constantine; and they would also learn something of his pupil and successor Acacius, who gave promise of an active episcopate, and was, by all accounts, a thoroughly clever man, ready-witted, well-informed, a good speaker, and competent for the part which he afterwards played as an organizer of a distinct section of the Arian body, and, indeed, for other parts which he by turns took up in a career so versatile as to win for him from the ultra-Arian Philostorgius the character of an accomplished knave.

The spring of 341, according to the most probable reckoning of time, found Athanasius awaiting his opponents' arrival, and preparing his yearly festal letter to his people. "See," he wrote, "I am writing to you from the city of Rome, where I shall keep the festival with brethren, but shall also in spirit and will be celebrating it with you." He had reason to dwell on the consolatory side of all distresses and trials; for his Alexandrians, and indeed all the faithful in Egypt, had had much to suffer. He had evidently been kept informed of the increased ferocity of the Arians. Orthodox bishops scourged and imprisoned; the aged confessor Sarapammon driven from his see; Potammon, who had lost an eye in the great persecutions, again a sufferer for the truth's sake, beaten so brutally that he seemed to have died under the blows, and only restored for a brief remnant of life by "careful nursing and fanning;" Athanasius's aunt harassed in her last days, refused burial by the usurping bishop, and carried to the grave by friends as if she were one of their kindred; widows and poor almsfolk bereft of their allowances, and the very oil-vessels broken before their faces;—such were the scenes which Athanasius had in mind when he wrote the words, out of the depth of his own spiritual experience, "These things happen in order to prove and test us,

that being found steadfast and approved in Christ's service, we may be heirs of the saints." "Whatever our foes can inflict will never exceed the mercies of God. . . . So let us not look at distresses and persecutions, but rather at the hope set before us. . . . In all things," he concludes, "let us praise Christ who hath called us, and so, through Christ, shall we be delivered from our foes." He wrote, about the same time, to his friend Serapion, bishop of Thmuis, informing him that he had been obliged to confute the pretensions of some Meletians to be recognised as Churchmen by writing to the bishops of Syria; "and bishops of Palestine wrote to me in reply, confirming the judgment passed against the Meletians." Among these friendly prelates, probably, was Maximus of Jerusalem, who, as we have seen, had quitted the Eusebian party in 335. Athanasius had also to warn Serapion against the scandal which would ensue, if the Egyptian Christians —meaning those outside Alexandria itself—did not observe the coming Lent like the rest of the Church; and to notify the appointments which had been made, under his authority, to thirteen vacant sees within his jurisdiction. "This letter," we are told, "he wrote from the city of Rome." There was, however, nearer at hand a powerful sustainer of the Alexandrians' constancy in the person of Antony, who, as he dwelt on his mountain—still called by his own name—between the Nile and the Red Sea, looking down upon the level ground far beneath, with its gushing springs and its date-palms, and the little strip of cornfield and herb-garden—"kept his heart watchful," says Athanasius, and had ready interest and sympathy for all who, either bringing him periodical gifts of food, or coming to him for spiritual help, told him of the sufferings of the faithful. He wrote more than once to remonstrate with Gregory; but Gregory treated the letters with contempt. He wrote also to the military commander Valacius, who was active in the persecution: "I see wrath coming upon thee; cease to persecute Christians, lest it overtake thee!" Valacius laughed, threw down the letter, and spat upon it, threatening to "come and look after Antony;" afterwards, however—in less than five days, says Athanasius—he met his death by the sudden fury of a horse which had previously been the gentlest in his possession.

It was in the spring of 341 that the Roman envoys at last returned home. They brought a letter from the Eusebians, which Julius thought so offensive that he kept it to himself, hoping for

some explanation. There were, indeed, in it expressions of high respect for the orthodox, apostolic, and primeval Church of Rome, but it was urged that, after all, she had been founded from the East; that all bishops, irrespectively of the size of their cities, had the same authority; and that the writers had personal claims to respect fully equal to those of Julius. The letter, says Sozomen, was "forensic" in style—that is, it dealt in clever special pleading, not unmixed with rhetorical irony; and the writers, not very consistently, seem to have objected to the holding of a new council, and accused Julius of violating the canons, and "rekindling the flame" of an old strife. Moreover, said they, the notice of the council did not allow them time enough: Julius ought to have considered the difficulties which their sovereign's Persian war would, for the present, put in the way of some of their number. Again, why did Julius write in his sole person? why did he address the "Eusebians" instead of all the Easterns? why had he shown partiality to Athanasius? why had he distrusted their statements? why had he disregarded the authority of a council (*i.e.* in not treating the see of Alexandria as vacated by Athanasius's deposition at the Tyrian synod)? Reference was also made to the case of Marcellus, as if he had induced Julius to sanction "his impiety towards Christ." The letter declared, further, that peace reigned in the Eastern Churches, and that all were of one mind in disowning the ex-bishop of Alexandria.

By way of further securing their ground, the Eusebians resolved to take advantage, once again, of a great church solemnity, for the holding of a council in their own interests. Ten years before, Constantine had laid the foundations of a new church at Antioch, which his biographer Eusebius describes as unique in grandeur. It had now, at last, been completed; in the middle of a large cloistered court an octagonal structure towered up to a vast height, with adjacent buildings of different stories, and in its interior so lavishly decorated that it became popularly known as the Golden Church, "Dominicum aureum." In the summer of 341 the dedication took place; ninety-seven bishops assembled, and Constantius himself was present. Flacillus would be only too glad to utilise such a gathering for the purposes of his party; but it must be observed that many of the prelates could not be called Arianizers, and that, although Maximus of Jerusalem refused to attend, there were bishops of high reputation and virtual orthodoxy, such as the amiable Dianius of Cappadocian Cæsarea, to sanction

the proceedings of this "Dedication Council," as it is called, by their unhesitating co-operation. The character of the council has seemed twofold, and given rise to some perplexity. Hilary of Poitiers, ever desirous to conciliate the moderate Arians, calls it a "synod of holy men;" and its canons have been respected by the Eastern Church. Yet it committed itself to doctrinal formulas which were, to say the least, inadequate, and to acts of hostility against Athanasius. To explain this, we need not resort to the hypothesis of *two* dedication synods, an orthodox and a heterodox; rather may we suppose that many of the bishops were inexperienced in theological questions, and could not look at Church matters from the Athanasian point of view. It would thus be easy for the astute Eusebian leaders, with their plan of attacking the Nicene Council indirectly by a direct attack on the position of Athanasius, to represent his conduct in an unfavourable light, to prejudice their brethren against him, and so to lead them to acquiesce in dogmatic language which *seemed* orthodox, but which ignored the creed of 325.

The first procedure of this synod "in Encæniis" was to pass twenty-five canons, of which the following were the most important.

I. Severe penalties for all who break the law about the time of Easter, as fixed by "the great and holy Council" (a judicious exhibition of respect for Nicæa).

II. 1. Excommunication of those who carelessly and irreverently go out of church before the Eucharistic service, properly speaking, begins.

2. Excommunications to be respected; no communion with any under such sentence.

IV. The fourth canon was aimed at Athanasius. A bishop, a priest, or deacon, lawfully deposed, who shall presume afterwards to officiate, is never to have hope of restoration. This was based on an older canon which ranks as twenty-eighth among the "Apostolic" canons; but that referred to a just deposition, and this very Antiochene law implies the action of the accused bishop's own synod, whereas the synod at Tyre was *not* Athanasius's own. This canon was afterwards used against St. Chrysostom.

VIII. Country presbyters not to send letters of communion—or at least, only to neighbouring bishops; but Chorepiscopi of good repute may send them. This canon implies what a later canon of the same series asserts, the character of Chorepiscopi as

real bishops, although, as we have seen in regard to an Ancyran canon, the exercise of their authority was limited by the terms of their appointment.

IX. Another canon, based on the "older rule of the fathers," safeguards the (1) rights of metropolitans: "the provincial bishops are to know that the bishop presiding in the metropolis is also charged with the care of the whole province," and not to act without him except in matters simply diocesan. (2) At the same time, their authority is to be kept within limits; they are not to interfere with bishops' ordinary jurisdiction, nor, in provincial matters, to act alone.

XII. A deposed bishop, etc., to have one court of appeal, "a larger synod:" if he "troubles the emperor" after such synod's adverse judgment (thus seeking a *State* court of final appeal), his case to be treated as closed.

XIV. If provincial bishops differ on an accused bishop's case, the metropolitan is to call in some bishops of the nearest province to sit with them. This canon implies that the patriarchal or primatial system was not yet properly at work.

XIX. The nineteenth develops the fourth Nicene. "A bishop not to be ordained (*i.e.* consecrated) without the presence, or at least the written approval, of the majority of the new comprovincials. Otherwise his "ordination" is void. If, it is added, some contradict from contentiousness, let the majority prevail.

XX. Provincial synods to meet yearly, (1) in third week of Easter-time, (2) on 15th of October. Priests and deacons, having complaints to make, to appear at the synod. (Thus priests and deacons were not constituent members of such synod.)

To these canons was annexed a synodal letter, addressed to all bishops. The next proceeding of the Dedication Council was the confirmation of the previous sentence against Athanasius—an act which, as the bishops, or many of them, would be assured by the Eusebian leaders, was not to be taken as prejudicing the authority of the Nicene Council; for the question was not of Athanasius's faith, but of his conduct. And, this step taken, the next was to obtain the council's sanction for three statements of doctrine. Let us see what these were.

The first of these "creeds of Antioch" begins uneasily and abruptly, in a tone recalling the proverb, "Qui s'excuse, s'accuse." "We have *not*," the bishops say, "become followers of Arius; for how should we that are bishops follow a presbyter?" They affirm

their fidelity to the original unchanged faith, and add that Arius, in fact, had explained himself in a sense conformable to it; so that, as they express it, "it is *we* who have admitted *him*." But this brief and vague formula was soon deemed unsatisfactory, and superseded by a longer one, which is specifically "*the* Creed of the Dedication," and became the favourite formula of the Semi-Arians. It was attributed, says Sozomen, to the martyr Lucian of Antioch, who seems to have practically, for a time, anticipated the moderate Arian view, and been in consequence out of communion with three successive bishops of Antioch. It has been suggested that it was his recension of an original Antiochene creed; but Athanasius treats the formula—at least part of it—as a "new" work of "the Eusebian party." It is for the most part Catholic, except that, of course, it omits the Homoousion; it adopts the various reading of John i. 18, "the only-begotten God;" it owns the Son as God from God and Perfect from Perfect, as living Word and Wisdom, true Light, and incapable of change; and especially calls Him the "adequate Image of the Father's Godhead, essence, and glory"—a phrase which, as Gwatkin says, is really equivalent to Homoousion, although it had been used by Asterius. What is called the personal oneness of Jesus with the Divine Son could not be more explicitly emphasized than in this formula. But its language has at least one questionable element, where it speaks of the Father, Son, and Spirit as "three in hypostasis"—the word being here used, not as at Nicæa, for essence, but for personal subsistence—"and one in concord," where a Catholic would have said, one in nature, the essential unity being the basis of the moral. The creed ends, like the Nicene, with anathemas; but they do not absolutely condemn Arianism, but only the coarser and more outspoken forms of that heresy, such as the assertion that the Son is "a creature *as one of the creatures*"—an assertion which, as was afterwards unhappily proved at the Council of Ariminum, might be repudiated without owning Him as Uncreate. One more formula, specially anti-Marcellian, was in some sense sanctioned by the Council: it was a personal statement of belief by a bishop named Theophronius, beginning solemnly, "God, whom I call as a witness on my soul, knows that I believe," etc., and acknowledging the Son as "perfect God from perfect God," and as "being 'with God' in hypostasis," *i.e.* personally subsisting; it ended with special condemnation of the followers of "Marcellus, of Sabellius,

or of Paul of Samosata." But it was by no means substituted for the creed ascribed to Lucian. So ended the proceedings of this famous assembly, probably in the autumn of 341.

It was near the end of this year, when Athanasius had been waiting eighteen months at Rome, that Julius resolved to wait no longer for the Eusebians, and assembled the long-expected council, consisting of more than fifty bishops, in the church of the Roman presbyter Vito, who had been one of the representatives of Silvester in the Nicene Council, and must have been regarded in Rome as a representative of Nicene faith. The Eusebian letter was now read; the Athanasian case was examined in detail; the report of the Mareotic commission, brought to Rome some two years before by the three Eusebian envoys, was considered; presbyters from Egypt deposed to the atrocities which followed on Gregory's intrusion, and particularly to the harsh or cruel treatment of old men who had been many years in the episcopate, and the banishment of bishops and of others who had refused to communicate with Gregory. Marcellus, then at Rome, attested, or at least affirmed, the infliction of similar outrages at Ancyra; many prelates from Thrace and Syria and other countries had the same tale to tell, and, in some cases, very grave charges to make against the Eusebian party—charges, it would seem, impugning personal character. All the evidence, on both sides, being taken into account, the Roman synod pronounced Athanasius to be innocent: when he had first come to Rome, we are told by Julius that his coming was taken as presumptive of his innocence; but now, after this long delay and full investigation, the bishops "confirmed towards him their communion and their love." Marcellus was acquitted of heresy, on the ground partly of his own protestations in a letter to Julius, which adopts the Old-Roman form of "the Apostles' Creed," and explicitly identifies the Son with the Word—and partly of the declarations of Vito and his brother-delegate at Nicæa, Vincentius, who assured the Council that he had there contended for the truth,—evidence which, considering the point at issue, could hardly be relevant. One might wish to think that the old bishop of Ancyra had not fully or habitually realised the outcome and result of his speculations, and could honestly say that he believed, with the Church, in a Divine Christ, who was Himself the personal Word and the Eternal Son; but his statement did not affirm the endlessness of the kingship of Christ, which was in effect denied by the theory of a merely

temporary relation between Him and the Word. It would appear also that Asclepas of Gaza, who had been deposed even earlier than Eustathius,—had afterwards, in the presence of Eusebius of Cæsarea, been acquitted of charges brought against him,—had returned, and been again expelled on the charge of breaking an altar and causing bloodshed,—was next declared innocent by this Council. Julius, then, in the name of the Council, wrote a letter to the Eusebians, naming seven of them especially, and addressing them as "beloved brethren," who were not yet finally committed to a wrong line: he replied to their captious objections, and after stating the reasons for the Council's judgment, again offered them the opportunity of confronting at Rome those whom they had accused. Two points in this synodal letter, which well deserves praise for its argumentative skill and "judicial tone," have received particular notice. (1) Julius says that the Nicene Council rightly ordered a reconsideration, by one synod, of the decrees of another that had preceded it. Does this point to some now lost Nicene canon? Probably not; Julius may only mean that at Nicæa the decisions of the Alexandrian Council were not deemed final. (2) He complains that (in the proceedings at Tyre and elsewhere) the Eusebians had neglected to follow the old Church rule, according to which, if any bishops were accused, "words should have been written to *us all*, that so a just sentence might be determined *by all*,"—*i.e.* the cases should have been brought before the whole collective episcopate, or (he must mean) before what might be called a representative number. This had not been done, and therefore the bishops would again have to assemble, "in order that the condemnation of those who are found guilty might take place in the presence of all." But after thus defining the general rule, Julius proceeds to a particular case, that of the Alexandrian Church; "the custom was first to write to us, and so to get a just sentence passed from *this place:*" if a bishop of Alexandria were suspected, he contends that the right course would have been to give notice to the Church of Rome—and this, with a Roman laxity of statement, he calls a tradition from the "blessed Apostle Peter," which, as such, he communicates to the Eusebians, adding that it is pretty well admitted throughout the Church. This passage evidently fails to justify the gloss of Socrates and Sozomen, that "no canon was deemed valid without the Roman bishop's consent;" their statement, says Tillemont significantly, "appears different from what the letter contains;" but what does Julius mean? Apparently he

is referring to the close traditional connexion between the "sees of St. Peter and St. Mark," and probably thinking, in particular, of the complaints made to Dionysius of Rome, when his Alexandrian namesake was suspected of heresy. Here, then, just where on the papal theory Julius should have claimed to be the supreme judge in all cases of bishops throughout the Church, he describes the whole episcopate as the true judicial body, and ranks himself among its members, as one of "us all;" and it is only in the special case of Alexandria that he cites usage and tradition for a judicial authority in the Roman Church. In taking leave of this letter, which impresses the reader by its logical ability and its grave dignity, we must again observe that it is written in the name of the Roman Council, not solely of the Roman bishop; and thus, in the Roman Council's judgment, it is Central and South Italy that speaks as well as Rome.

And now the young sovereign of Italy and the West, Constans, comes upon the scene. He had withstood the demands of his brother Constantine for the cession of certain territories, and, by a war which ended in Constantine's death, had become lord of the whole Western realm. Like too many other emperors, he was spoiled by sovereign power, and lowered himself by sensualities which Constantius, with all his faults, would have scorned. But at this time, as far as it appears, his better qualities—straightforward simplicity, kindness of heart, an honest love of Christianity and respect for good men and sacred things—were in the ascendant. He was much interested, at this time, in the endeavour to abolish pagan sacrifices: he had already commissioned Athanasius to prepare for him some "bound volumes of the Scriptures;" and his chief adviser in matters ecclesiastical was Athanasius's friend Maximin, bishop of Treves. As sole monarch of the West, it was important to the Eusebians to conciliate him; and, at the same time, they were naturally desirous to persuade the Western Church that opposition to Athanasius did not involve heresy,—to recommend their own theology to the downright Latin mind. And so, when about the end of 341—"a few months," says Athanasius, after the Dedication Council—they felt a certain dissatisfaction with their recent creeds, as if something more "perfect" might be framed, they determined to draw up a new one, and present it to the Western Emperor. It was perhaps the least objectionable that they ever made, and was reproduced on three later occasions; and the anathemas appended to it expressly condemned the formula of

the old Arians, "The Son was from nothing," and the assertion that He was "from another hypostasis (=essence) and not from God;" but as to the eternity of His existence, it was less satisfactory, only condemning the dictum, "*Time* was when He was not," and thus leaving a loophole for evasion. Like the Theophronian formulary, but still more emphatically, it excluded the Marcellian notion of the temporary nature of Christ's Sonship and kingdom: "Whose kingdom, being indissoluble, will remain to infinite ages!" Armed with this document, four Eusebian envoys, Narcissus, Maris, Theodore of Heraclea, and Mark—the last named being bishop of Arethusa in Syria, a man of many virtues, who showed his great constancy under pagan inflictions in the reign of Julian—set forth on their journey to the imperial court at Treves, and on arriving gave in the new creed, as from the Antiochene Council, by way of guarantee for their soundness of faith and for the orthodoxy of the Eastern Church at large. Such is Athanasius's account. Socrates says that the bishops were also charged by Constantius to explain to his brother the case against Athanasius and Paul: nor is this unlikely, so far as Athanasius is concerned; as for Paul, he had not then visited Italy. However, the journey of the envoys was fruitless; Constans dismissed them from his presence, acting no doubt under the influence of Maximin, who would not admit them into the cathedral of Treves, and so incurred the hatred of their party.

This visit of the Eusebian envoys took place early in 342. In November of that year they lost the great ecclesiastical politician from whom their party took its name: Eusebius, once of Berytus, then of Nicomedia, lastly of Constantinople, died in the fulness of power and success, leaving a name not only bound up with the Arian heresy, but also suggestive of the lowering of religious tone which a secular atmosphere can produce in ecclesiastics, as in the feudalised prelates of the eleventh century, the English politician bishops of the fifteenth, or the prince-bishops who sometimes forgot that they were priests. His death was a signal for new disturbances: Paul reclaimed and regained his see; the Arian party elected Macedonius, and he was consecrated, not in the newly completed basilica of St. Sophia, but in a church dedicated to St. Paul near the opening of the Golden Horn, by five bishops, four of whom had sat on the Mareotic commission. Constantius was absent at the time: on hearing of these events, he ordered a general named Hermogenes, then on his way towards Thrace, to turn aside into

Constantinople and drive out Paul. But a multitude of people rose in defence of their true bishop. Hermogenes persisted, and employed military force; the mob, in wild fury, seized him, dragged him through the city, killed him, and cast the mangled corpse into the Propontis. Constantius hastened to the capital, punished this outrage in person, deprived the people of the larger portion of their corn-allowance, and expelled Paul once again; but, regarding Macedonius's appointment as in some sense the cause of the tumult, refused to recognise him as bishop of Constantinople, and only allowed him to hold services in St. Paul's church. He then returned to his palace at Antioch; while Paul, as it seems, received orders to reside at his native city of Thessalonica, whence he may afterwards have repaired to Rome. There he seems to have again met Athanasius; for it was not until after three full years of residence at Rome that an unexpected summons from Constans obliged the great exile to repair to Milan. He was not very willing to do so. He inquired of his friends what the imperial letter portended: he then learned that some bishops (perhaps Hosius and Maximin) had requested their sovereign, now returned from Britain and free of his Frankish war, to write to his brother and demand a new General Council, as the only cure of the Church's wounds. "Accordingly," he writes, "I went to Milan:" it was apparently in the summer of 343, for chronological reasons make the old date of 347 impossible; and one has now to connect the memory of his visit with the other ecclesiastical glories of the city where Ambrose became bishop, and where Augustine became a Christian. Constans received Athanasius with the kindness which secured his lasting gratitude and affection: Protasius, bishop of Milan, went with him into the presence-chamber, while Eugenius, the "master of the palace," stood just outside the "veil" or curtain that hung, as usual, before the inner rooms of emperors or of judges. The Emperor announced that he had written to his brother requesting that a Council might meet. This, it seems, was the substance of the interview. Athanasius stayed some weeks in Milan, and then, by desire of Constans, met Hosius in Gaul, and was fellow-traveller with that venerable bishop to the destined place of the Council, the politically important city of Sardica or Serdica, which, as situated in Mœsia, was "on the verge of the two empires," but just within the dominions of their "protector."

At this time and place, then, about a hundred and seventy

prelates met, of whom a small majority were Westerns, including the bishops of Sardica, Thessalonica, Milan, Ravenna, Verona, Barcelona, Cordova, Carthage, Lyons, Arles, Sens, Paris, Treves,—Julius of Rome being represented by Philoxenus, his former messenger, and Archidamus. The seventy-six Easterns included such Eusebian leaders as Stephen, then bishop of Antioch, Menophantus of Ephesus, Acacius, Theodosius, Mark, Basil, Eudoxius of Germanicia (afterwards notorious for his profanity), and others, but not Gregory, nor George of Laodicea, who is said to have stayed at home for fear of what might befall him at the Council. (Paul, the orthodox bishop of Constantinople, was neither at Sardica, as Socrates thought, nor detained at home by his people, as Theodoret surmised.) Among the less distinguished Eusebian prelates appears the name of Quirius, clearly a corruption of Ischyras—that unhappy impostor having been made a bishop for the hamlet where he had pretended to be a presbyter. Among the Easterns, according to the testimony of two of their number, were "many" personally Catholic in belief, that is, who substantially agreed with the Catholics, although they scrupled at the Nicene formula. But, as at Antioch, they were dominated by the Eusebian leaders, who, as they travelled to Sardica from the East, agreed among themselves as to their line of action: they would not allow the decisions of Tyre and Antioch to be reconsidered, and therefore they would take no part in the Council if Athanasius, or others condemned in their Eastern Councils, were admitted to seats at Sardica. In that case, they would simply report their own arrival *pro formâ;* and accordingly, when they found not only that the two great civil officers, "Counts" Musonianus and Hesychius, whom they had brought with them in hopes of thereby gaining the upper hand, would not be allowed to enter the Council, and that many "who had suffered at their hands" were come to bear witness against them, but also that Athanasius and Marcellus, and Asclepas of Gaza, and Lucius of Hadrianople, who had been formerly loaded with chains by Arian persecutors, were allowed to sit in the cathedral of Sardica with Protogenes the bishop, who had given his assent to the condemnation of Marcellus, and with Hosius and the other Westerns to express their opinions freely, and even "to celebrate the divine Mysteries,"—the Easterns in disgust shut themselves up within apartments which Constans, apparently, had placed at the bishops' disposal within his own vast palace—that palace which, some thirty years before, had witnessed the horrors of

Galerius's frightful death-bed. It would have been better, perhaps, if the Westerns, in their relations with Athanasius and the others, had been more punctilious in avoiding whatever might seem like a disposition to prejudge the case in their favour; but it is not true to say that both parties, Eastern and Western, alike came "with their hands tied"—that the Westerns were bent on upholding as final the decisions of a Council in Italy, and regarded it as the Easterns regarded their own Councils in Syria and Palestine. The Easterns *did* prejudge the case against Athanasius; the Westerns viewed the whole case as open, and therefore were strictly in their rights when they treated him as a man not yet found guilty. A series of messages, challenges, recriminations, went on for "many days." Athanasius and Marcellus repeatedly expressed their readiness to confront their accusers, who on their part sent word to Hosius, Protogenes, and the rest, that they would not appear until "those condemned men" were excluded; and then they would appear, and "make known the sentences passed by former Councils" against them, without going into the question of Marcellus's heresy, which, said they, was patent on the face of his book. This dogged refusal to treat the Sardican meeting as competent to re-hear all the cases was provoking enough; but Hosius did not lose patience, or abandon the hope of conciliation. He invited some of the Easterns to confer with him in the church-buildings, where he was lodged, and there supplemented the warning which the Westerns generally had sent, "Come and state your charges, on pain of being deemed calumniators," by language more calculated to persuade. "Do not be afraid of any failure of justice. Nothing is settled; everything can be discussed. Come to the Council; or, if you prefer it, come to me alone, and state your case,—and if you can prove it against Athanasius, I will guarantee that the Council shall condemn him. And if you fail to prove it—if he proves his own innocence, and you still object to communicating with him—I will persuade him, even in that case, to come with me into Spain." Athanasius, according to Hosius (who stated this incident, years afterwards, in a letter to Constantius), acquiesced in this prosposal; doubtless, he felt that he could afford to do so. The Easterns were deaf to all Western proposals or invitations: some of them, indeed, might have yielded, but that their more resolute brethren kept them strictly confined to the palace; from which confinement, however, two bishops, Macarius and Asterius, contrived to escape, and earned the bitter wrath of the Eusebians by describing

before the Western Council their programme and their tyrannous conduct.

The end of it was that the minority withdrew from Sardica, on the pretence of tidings from the Persian war. But, in fact, they simply migrated to "the large and noble city" of Philippopolis, in Thrace, and thus within the realm of Constantius; disregarding a final warning letter sent after them by the Sardican bishops, and assuming for themselves the position of the true "Council of Sardica." After this "unseemly and suspicious flight," as Athanasius calls it, they drew up a synodal letter professing to be written from Sardica, and addressed to Gregory of Alexandria, to the bishop of Nicomedia, and to their few supporters in the West, and to all Catholic bishops under heaven. In this document they denounced Marcellus, and gave their own version of the case of Athanasius: *e.g.* that the Mareotic commission had proceeded on first-rate evidence; that Athanasius on his return had done worse than before, and had, in particular, brought heathen force to back him, and, after some further sacrileges, had fled to Rome and beguiled the West. The letter affirms also, that horrible impieties had signalised the return of Marcellus, Paul, Asclepas, and Lucius: *e.g.* that "at Ancyra the consecrated Body of the Lord was hung round the necks of priests, as they were dragged in insult through the forum; that at Hadrianople the sacrifice consecrated by priests opposed to Lucius was thrown to the dogs." By "persistent flatteries," the letter proceeds, Athanasius deceived several innocent bishops; but what was said in his favour by those who had not heard the case tried could have no weight. Then Julius is referred to, as having "too easily" received Athanasius into communion; the Westerns, having taken this "rash" step, were concerned to defend themselves while seeming to defend him. Others who had been deposed in the East were acquitted in the West by judges ignorant of the records of their deposition. It was quite unfair on the part of the Athanasians to summon the Easterns to defend themselves: it was a reversal of the positions of the two parties. Athanasius had once condemned Asclepas, and Paul had condemned Athanasius. (!) The Eusebians then proceed to give their own version of the events at Sardica. They had obeyed the summons to a Council, but, on arriving, had been shocked to find that Athanasius and the other offenders were admitted as members of the assembly; and when they had proposed to Hosius and Protogenes that a new commission of Easterns

and Westerns should inquire, in Egypt, into the charges against Athanasius, this proposal was refused. They then denounce the other party as an unscrupulous set of liars; proclaim themselves champions of the rights of the Eastern Church; retort the charge of schism on the Westerns; betray a theological animus by imputing "blasphemy" to Athanasius, and mark out as excommunicate Julius, "the leader of the wicked," Hosius, Protogenes, Maximin, and Gaudentius of Narcissus; winding up with a creed which Socrates, by some strange carelessness, treats as ultra-Arian, whereas it is, at the worst, only inadequate, and is (with a very few verbal differences) the creed already presented by four deputies to Constans: it is very explicit on the everlasting nature of Christ's kingdom, and anathematizes all who deny Him to be God.

Abandoned by the East, the Sardican Council, consisting of ninety-seven bishops, of whom apparently the greater number came from Illyricum, set itself to its work under the presidency of Hosius, who is not to be regarded as "legate of Rome," but had the first place as a tribute to his personal dignity. Evidence was produced against Arianizing tyrants; Lucius of Hadrianople held up the chains he had worn, others exhibited sword-cuts, others declared that they had been nearly starved, others spoke of whole churches terrorised by magistrates or by mobs; letters were read which Theognis of Nicæa was proved by deacons who had served under him to have written in order to exasperate the emperors by lies against Athanasius and others; the Mareotic report was read, as before, at Rome, and found to be *ex parte* and untrustworthy; two ex-Meletian presbyters testified that Ischyras had never been one of the Meletian clergy; the report of Asclepas's former acquittal, which had been formerly drawn up at Antioch, was also produced. Marcellus was acquitted of heresy, partly on the untenable ground that his obnoxious statements had been advanced in the way of inquiry and discussion, and so did not convey his real mind, but partly also, it is said, after a full reading of the contexts of the impugned passages, whereby the Council satisfied itself that he had "never affirmed the Word to have come into existence from holy Mary, or His kingship to be but temporary" (an exculpation far from satisfactory, for he was supposed to have asserted this, not of the Word, but of the *Son*). At the end of the investigation, the Council dealt out excommunications against the Eusebian leaders. Three are named first, as having, wolf-like, broken into Churches: Gregory, Basil, and Quintianus, usurpers of the sees of

Athanasius, Marcellus, and Asclepas. These are declared to be simply no bishops, and are excommunicated. Excommunication and deposition are then pronounced against Theodore, Narcissus, Acacius, Stephen, Ursacius, Valens, Menophantus, and George, as heretics, who, "having severed the Son and alienated the Word from the Father," ought themselves to be "severed from the Catholic Church and the Christian name."

Thus the Western Church decided, for its own part, the great Athanasian cause. It seems that Hosius and Protogenes proposed a formula explanatory of the Nicene Creed in view of recent heretical developments; it is extant, and insists on the uniqueness of the Sonship, on the Son's identity with the Word and essential oneness with the Father, on the true divinity of Christ, and on the eternity of His kingdom. It was not, however, adopted by the Council, which would not even appear to add to the Nicene formulary: nearly twenty years later, Athanasius, in his "Tome to the Antiochenes," took pains to correct a wrong impression on this point. But a series of canons is attributed to the Council, and may with fair reason be regarded as genuine, in spite of the difficulty that seventy-five years later the African Church knew of no Sardican canons, and that no mention of them is made by Socrates. But the African Church did not then know of the true Sardican Council: the silence of Greek writers may be due to the fact that the Sardican canons were intended for the West; and one of them (as we shall see presently) seems to have been indistinctly known to a Constantinopolitan Council in 382. What is more, Gratus of Carthage, presiding in a council five years after the Sardican, gives his recollections as to one of its enactments (the fifteenth canon in the Latin). Only one set of these canons need here be mentioned at length—that group which specially characterizes the Sardican legislation, and provides for an appeal to the see of Rome. The third canon enacts—

(1) No bishop is to go, uninvited, into a province not his own. Compare the thirteenth canon of Antioch.

(2) Disputes of bishops to be settled in their provinces.

(3) But—here is the main point—if a bishop deems himself wronged by the sentence of his comprovincials, and wishes for a new trial, "then," said Hosius, "if it pleases you, let us honour the memory of the Apostle Peter, so that the judges of the case should write to Julius, bishop of Rome, in order that, if he thinks it necessary (so the Latin, and this is implied by the whole context as in

the Greek), the trial may be renewed by means of the bishops who live near that province" (compare the fourteenth Antiochene), "and he may name judges. But if it cannot be shown that the case calls for a new trial, the existing decision must not be disturbed."

(4) This is really a suggestion by Bishop Gaudentius: "You should add that when a bishop, thus deposed by his comprovincials" (lit. those who live near him), "announces that he means to procure another trial, his see should not be filled up until the bishop of Rome, having examined the case, pronounces against him."

(5) Hosius proposes as before: "If a bishop in such a case has appealed to the bishop of Rome, the latter may, if he pleases, think good to write to the bishops of the province nearest that in which the case arose, that *they* may settle it. But if such an appellant can persuade the bishop of Rome to send a presbyter or presbyters from himself, that bishop may do so, and such presbyters are to sit with the bishops, and hold their principal's authority. The Roman bishop is to choose between these two courses." This was the first of the two canons quoted as Nicene by a Roman legate to the African Church in 418.

Now let us pause to see what these Sardican rules amount to. On them was built up a vast fabric of appellate jurisdiction of the see of Rome: what is its basis? For, observe, previously no provision existed for an appeal from the provincial synod. Now, such provision is made, and comes to this. A bishop may require his provincial judges to write to the Roman bishop with a view to a fresh trial, and may also himself write as appealing for it. Then the Roman bishop is to consider whether the case requires a fresh trial. If he thinks it does not, then, of course, the provincial decision is to stand. If he thinks it does, he may commit the fresh trial to the bishops of the province nearest the one concerned, with or without the admission of representatives of his own see to a place among such judges, as he may think most desirable.

Now, in estimating this power thus conceded, we may at the outset remark that it clearly was not meant to be a personal grant to Julius for his lifetime. He is named, but the council is evidently including his successors in its view of "the Roman bishop." But, next, two points are important to be noticed:—

(1) The power, whatever it be, is *granted:* it is not recognised as inherent. There is indeed a reference to the memory of St.

Peter; but if there had been a pre-existing appellate jurisdiction belonging to the "Cathedra Petri," the language of the canon would have been different. As it stands, the plain meaning is, "We must put a certain power into some hands; into what hands so fitly as those of the bishop who specifically occupies St. Peter's seat?" The Council feels that there is a moral suitableness in selecting that bishop for this high trust. And doubtless the steadfast orthodoxy which the present bishop had maintained in the Arian contest had something, or rather much, to do with the selection.

(2) The power is *limited*. The Roman bishop may not

(*a*) evoke the case to Rome, *motu proprio;*

nor (*b*) call the provincial synod to account;

nor (*c*) form the new tribunal at his own pleasure;

nor (*d*) preside in it;

nor (*e*) judge the case by himself.

The power given is very much less than what was given by the Council of Chalcedon, in such cases, either to any primate or to "the see of Constantinople:" it is a power, in short, inconsistent with the theory of papal supremacy. We must, in fact, say that, both in its scope and in its origin, this power bears witness against the subsequent papal claim; and that had Julius believed himself to be the Supreme Pontiff, the ruler of all bishops, the fountain of all jurisdiction, he could not have accepted what these canons gave him without stultifying his own position in the Church. And it may reasonably be urged in favour of the genuineness of these canons, that their language about Rome suits the time and the circumstances, whereas a Roman forger at a later date would have been pretty sure to assign larger powers to the First See.

Another canon has quite a different purport in its Greek and Latin forms, although in both it refers to the duty of comprovincial bishops in regard to the filling-up of a vacant see. The Council of Constantinople in 382 quotes as Nicene a provision that these bishops might at pleasure call in the "neighbouring bishops" to assist in such consecration. This is not in the fourth Nicene canon, but something like it is in the Latin form of the sixth Sardican, which directs that if only one bishop is left in a province, and he neglects to consecrate another, those of the neighbouring province are to exhort him to join with them in that work. These bishops of the Council seem to have some knowledge

of the Sardican canon, but not as such, and to have carelessly mixed up their impressions about it with the text of the Nicene.

Another orders that sees should be erected in cities rather than in villages or small towns; and this has an interest for us, in that it was cited when the Council of London in 1075 removed bishoprics from Sherborne to Sarum, and from Selsey to Chichester, and afterwards acted upon in the transfer of sees from Crediton, Dorchester (in Oxfordshire), and Elmham to Exeter, Lincoln, and Norwich.

Other canons are directed against growing abuses, such as the African bishops' habit of resorting to the court in a selfish eagerness for secular promotion, or the carelessness shown in appointing to bishoprics men who had never given proof of fitness by serving for a due time in the ministry. It is ordered on this latter point, that in accordance with apostolic teaching and primitive rule, no man shall be consecrated until he has passed through the grades of reader, deacon, and presbyter, and that no one shall be hastily ordained as deacon or as presbyter. Five canons refer to troubles or disorders at Thessalonica, the capital of that region, afterwards called Eastern Illyricum, to which most of the members belonged. It seems that in a vacancy of the Thessalonian see, two competitors, Eutychianus and Musæus, had acted as rival bishops; the council reduces them to the *status* of lay churchmen.

The last canon orders that a bishop who breaks these decrees shall be liable to deposition; and, to carry this out, if any one of the prelates now assembled sees (after his return) a bishop travelling on the high-road, he is directed to ask—bluntly enough—"Are you going to the court? if so, why?" If the traveller says, "The Emperor has summoned me," let him pass on. If not—if he has only a selfish purpose—let the bishop not sign his letters of commendation.

To these canons must be added an arrangement made at Sardica, as to the reckoning of Easter for fifty years to come.

The remaining documents of the Sardican Council are its letters. (1) The Encyclical, given, like so many other papers of deep interest, by Athanasius in his Apology, and in a Latin version by Hilary, informs all Catholic bishops as to the facts now ascertained, and thus explains the ground on which Athanasius, Marcellus, and Asclepas had received full acquittal. The letter ends by an exhortation, based on 2 Cor. vi. 14, Gal. i. 9, to hold no fellowship with the excommunicated Arian bishops—not to write to them,

nor to receive letters from them. The prelates who, not having attended the synod, received this Encyclical, wrote in great numbers to signify their adhesion, and among these were the British bishops. (2) A second letter, sent to the Alexandrian Church, exhorts that much-tried community "before all things to hold fast to the right faith of the Catholic Church" (a curious anticipation of the first words of the "Quicunque"). "Many grievous and dreadful troubles have you suffered, many insults and injuries has the Catholic Church undergone, but he that endureth to the end shall be saved; therefore contend above all things for the sound faith, and for the innocence of your bishop Athanasius." It is added that Gregory has been deposed, although, properly speaking, he never was a bishop (as to which we may observe that the distinction between irregularity and invalidity had not as yet been clearly laid down); and praise is bestowed on the four Alexandrian priests who had been persecuted by the Mareotic commission. (3) A letter nearly identical with this last was sent to the bishops of Egypt and Libya. (4) A Latin version of a letter to Julius is given by Hilary, in which is a passage recognising the fitness of reference, on the part of the bishops of each province, to "the head, that is, the see of Peter the Apostle;" a passage which, although, as Hefele admits, it comes in awkwardly, and looks not unlike an interpolation, is intelligible in a complimentary epistle from a great Western Church-assembly to the great primatial see of "Suburbicarian" Italy, the one "apostolic" see of the West, the see which the whole Church associated with the name of St. Peter. This letter distinguishes three subjects which had come before the Council:—Doctrine—Persons accused,—Outrages perpetrated by Arianizers. But it concludes suspiciously by naming only seven bishops as excommunicate. Three other letters, two professing to be by Athanasius, are insufficiently supported, and may be set aside as spurious.

We also gather from the letter to the Alexandrians that the Council wrote to the two emperors, requesting them to release the suffering Catholic confessors, and to restrain the civil courts from adjudicating in religious causes on any pretext of providing for the Church.

Thus ended the famous Council from which, as it would seem, so much had been hoped in the interests of peace among Christians at a time when so much of the world was still unchristianized. It was to have been a General Council: it failed to secure that

character, not only from the secession of the Easterns, but also partly from the imperfect representation of the West. Even within the Western Church, its influence was not all-pervading; and, strange as it may seem, St. Augustine in the early part of the next century knew of no Sardican Council save the heretical "conciliabulum" of Philippopolis, which, as we have seen, had usurped its name. The fraud had been so far successful as absolutely to efface the memory of a synod which, in the intention of those who assembled it, was to have represented the Church throughout all the world, and to appropriate its true name to the heterodox assembly of malcontent seceders, in the mind of a great light of the African Church, and probably of other prelates elsewhere. At Rome it was naturally otherwise; the Sardican Council had done honour to the "see of St. Peter," and Pope Julius had been present there by his legates, like Silvester at Nicæa; and the result of the Sardican deliberations had been the triumphant vindication of the great Confessor whom Julius had learned to love and honour, the emphatic affirmation of the judgment which Julius and his Roman Council had pronounced, and the enactment of Church laws which might loosely be regarded as, for the West, supplemental to the Nicene, and thus, by a considerable license of speech, came to be described at Rome as forming one body with the Nicene—as being, in effect if not in fact, "Nicene canons." In short, the Sardican Council aimed at being Œcumenical, but ended in being simply a great Western Synod, emphatically loyal to the Catholic faith.

CHAPTER XI.

THE CHURCH AFTER THE SARDICAN COUNCIL.

I.

The immediate result of the Council of Sardica was a widening of the breach between the Eastern and Western Churches, in so much that, according to Socrates, "the boundary line of communion could be pointed out at the Pass of Succi," where the mountains of Hæmus and Rhodope, as Ammianus expresses it, "separated Illyria from Thrace." The statement of Socrates, says Valesius, must not be strained to mean that the schism was formal and absolute; but for the present, those who had trusted that the meeting at Sardica might be a signal for the renewal of good understanding were compelled to think that it had rather deferred than hastened that consummation.

Fresh Arian persecutions immediately broke out. Theodulus of Trajanople had left Sardica before the Council dissolved: with Olympius of Æni, he was accused of crimes; he fled, was pursued, narrowly escaped with life, and was proscribed in an imperial letter which announced that, if found, he should be put to death. The two prelates who had gone over to the Westerns at Sardica were banished into Libya, and otherwise harshly treated. Lucius, on his return, boldly rebuked the Arian leaders, was again loaded with fetters on neck and hands, and sent to die in exile; and ten laymen of his church, employed in the manufactory of arms at Hadrianople, were put to death under orders from Constantius, for refusing to hold communion with the prelates excommunicated at Sardica. At Alexandria, two priests and three deacons were condemned to exile in Armenia; the city and harbours were strictly watched, to prevent the return of Athanasius and his banished clergy; and it was ordered that if they were found near Alexandria,

the magistrates should put them to death. The Arians also, according to Athanasius, made use of the "public conveyances," provided at the Emperor's cost, in order to hunt down persons suspected of orthodoxy: some were scourged, others imprisoned, others banished; some fled into the wilderness, others—as had been the case after Gregory's earlier persecution—were frightened into dissembling their belief.

Truly a dark prospect was that which lay before the Catholics of the East in the early months of 344. But Easter, which fell that year on April 15, brought them some hopes of relief. Constantius was then at Antioch, and there received a deputation from the late Council of Sardica, consisting of Vincent, bishop of Capua, —once a delegate of Rome at Nicæa, and afterwards unfortunate in the same function at a later Council,—and Euphrates, bishop of Cologne, whose name has been, as we shall see, associated with some questioning as to his doctrinal faithfulness. They came charged with the synodal letter to Constantius above referred to; and its request was backed by a letter from Constans, recommending the delegates' mission to his brother's favour, and apparently intimating a threat that if Constantius would not do justice to the banished prelates, especially to Athanasius, he himself would enforce their restoration. Constantius gave some signs of yielding; the Arians at Antioch took alarm, and Bishop Stephen attempted to ruin the character of the aged Euphrates by an infamous plot, which was to have been carried out by a young profligate named Onager. The woman who was employed by Onager for the purpose cried out in alarm when she understood the nature of the conspiracy; and on the next day, when an inquiry was held, in consequence of a false report against Euphrates, the truth came out, and Salianus, a military commander of high character, whom Constans had sent to accompany the delegates and urge his own demand on Constantius, insisted that, as Stephen's offence was a crime, he should be given over to the cognisance of the criminal law, instead of being dealt with by a synod. The distinction was judged reasonable, and a trial, accordingly, took place in the palace. Stephen was convicted; a synod of bishops was permitted to depose him, and his see was given to Leontius, a Phrygian by birth, who was canonically disqualified for the priesthood, and had therefore been deposed from it, but in spite of this was now made bishop of Antioch, doubtless on the ground of his singular astuteness, his diplomatic reserve in the expression of his own opinions

—in a word, his systematic crypto-Arianism. To place an avowed Arian in the see would have been too bold a step at a time when the exposure of Stephen's wickedness had been so damaging to the party; and therefore a man who had not in any way publicly committed himself to Arianizing opinions was thought the most desirable successor to Stephen himself. In fact, this was a perilous crisis for the Arian interests: just at the time when the imperative tone of the Catholic emperor of the West was shaking the resolution of his brother, a scandal of the gravest kind had arisen in the highest ranks of the Arian episcopate. And the consequence was at once felt. Constantius, as Athanasius admits, was shocked at Stephen's guilt, "and came to a better mind:" he inferred from this discovery the probable baselessness of other attacks on anti-Arian bishops; he ordered the recall of the Alexandrian ecclesiastics from Armenia; he even wrote, some think, either then or not long afterwards, to Athanasius himself, in terms of encouragement or of favour; but it is more probable that this reopening of communications with the man whom he had reinstated in 338, and begun to persecute in 340, did not take place until 345. However, the position of Arian affairs, throughout 344, was so unpromising, that about the end of that year the more moderate of the party resolved to make one more attempt to conciliate the Western Church. They had more reason than ever to desire thus to minimise their theological differences from the Westerns, or, at least, to remove the Western suspicions as to their substantial orthodoxy; and they had now an advantage which, three years before, they had not possessed. For the views ascribed to Marcellus had been, so to speak, illustrated, and their natural issue most offensively brought out, by the teaching of his pupil and friend, Photinus, bishop of Sirmium. This man was born at Ancyra, and had been deacon under Marcellus. We may dismiss the imputation of lax morality made against him as against other heretics; this would be a natural partisan imputation, and is inconsistent with the hold which he acquired and retained over his own people. Able, eloquent, persuasive, and bilingual, this Galatian pastor of a Latin flock and chief bishop of Western Illyricum was, as events proved, capable of grievously damaging the cause of orthodox faith if he came forward, as he did, as a champion of an offensive heresy. Like Marcellus, he held that an impersonal Word had before creation been immanent in God, had then come forth to energise in creation, and had ultimately dwelt with

pre-eminent fulness in Jesus Christ, the Son of Mary; but he seems to have been particularly explicit in denying the pre-existence of Christ, in contending that He was in no sense personally Divine, and thereby accentuating what his master had implied. He had thus, apparently during 343, become obnoxious not only to the Eastern enemies of Marcellus, and to all who dreaded a revival of Sabellianism, but also, and more especially, to many who, if they were unable to follow or appreciate a line of speculation or controversy as to the Logos, were at any rate keenly sensitive to all disparagement of their Saviour's dignity; for Photinus, as it has been well said, gave special offence by his degraded Christology, with its affinity to the Ebionitic conception of a merely human Jesus, and the Samosatene development of that conception into a Christ who *became* "Son of God" in virtue of his peerless human excellence. The Easterns, therefore, would feel that they could now point more successfully to the Marcellian tone of thought, as self-condemned in its second representative, and could be sure of much Western sympathy in denouncing it as eminently unchristian; even as, according to Hilary, the Arianizing Orientals in the great Council of Sirmium, a few years later, tried, in their letter to the Westerns, to make capital out of the condemnation of Photinus as against the Athanasian party, which had acquitted Marcellus. "You see," they would say, "the Athanasian tendency to Sabellianism. We told you of it before; you can now no longer ignore it." It would, therefore, be a good moment for recommending the Eastern doctrinal language to the favourable consideration of the Westerns. They accordingly drew up at Antioch what is known in history as the *Macrostichos Ecthesis*, or simply the "Macrostich," in which the creed brought to the West in 342 is followed up by a very "lengthy" statement, representing the better kind of Arianism, but giving a partially unsatisfactory turn to its disclaimers of Arianism proper, which, however, include the emphatic statement that the Son of God is "God perfect and true as to nature," unique in Sonship, "like in all things to the Father," and abiding in closest fellowship—as we might say, in coinherence—with the Father, but which fail to acknowledge His actual coequality. His Divine existence before all "ages," as one of three real Persons (*prosopa*), and not as a Logos now "mental" and now "uttered," and the endlessness of His kingdom, were asserted against Marcellus, and against him whom, by such a play on names as Eusebius of Cæsarea had delighted in,

the Macrostich designates as "Scotinus." The final paragraph explained that the formulary had been framed in order to clear away all unjust suspicion, and convince the Westerns that the Easterns believed like Churchmen, or, as it is expressed, "that all in the West may know, as to the Easterns, their Churchmindedness in the Lord." Charged with this formulary, a second set of four Eusebian deputies—Eudoxius, bishop of Germanicia, Macedonius of Mopsuestia, Demophilus, Martyrius, and others—travelled to Italy (three years after the journey of the first set with "the fourth Antiochene" creed in their hands), and appeared in the spring of 345 before an Italian council at Milan, which was engaged in condemning Photinus as a heretic, a step which had to be repeated once at Milan and twice at Sirmium. There, too, apparently, Valens and Ursacius were endeavouring to reconcile themselves with their Western brethren by a sort of recantation—anathematizing not only the opinions of Photinus, but the heresy of Arius and his supporters, who said that once the Son was not, that He was made out of nothing, that Christ was not God and Son of God before all worlds. The Eastern deputies presented the Macrostich; but it was much too lengthy for Western patience, and the Council, doubtless remembering the events of the winter of 343, cut the matter short by a decisive proposal. "All this is needless. If you say that the Easterns have been misunderstood, there is one, and only one, way of removing misapprehension. Do not think that we shall accept any creed but the Nicene; but will you, and those whom you represent, condemn the views of Arius?" Eudoxius and his companions, as Liberius of Rome, in a letter written eight years afterwards, informs us, declined this test, and "withdrew in much irritation from the Council." The Westerns, they found, were impervious to persuasion so long as one thing remained undone—and that was the very thing which the Easterns could not bring themselves to do. The recognition of Arius at Jerusalem in 335, if nothing else, stood in their way.

Athanasius, at the time of the Milanese Council, was apparently staying at Aquileia, which was at this period, by the Emperor Julian's account, a "rich, luxurious, and prosperous" seaport; its inhabitants were already known as "Veneti." He was the guest of Fortunatian, its bishop. It would seem that he must already have heard of the death of his rival Gregory; it had taken place, says the Arian History, "ten months after the return of Constantine to a better mind." This may synchronize with the substitution of

Leontius for Stephen; but that act would involve the summoning of a Council, which could hardly be got together before the summer of 344, and this would date the death of Gregory in the April of 345: it can hardly be postponed to June 26th, even if we could understand the Festal Index as meaning to date it on that day in 345, although mentioning it under 346. The *de facto* vacancy of the Alexandrian see encouraged Constantius to take further steps in the path of justice and humanity. According to Socrates, he received a second letter from Constans, menacing him with war if he declined to reinstate "Athanasius and Paul." But it is probable that whatever menaces Constans used were in fact conveyed at the Easter of 344; and Constantius would seem to have entertained the idea of restoring Athanasius from about the time of Leontius's accession. But he did not, apparently, write to Athanasius at once. His personal dislike or suspicion not unnaturally made him defer this particular task. After "a long time," as he himself says, he did write. It may be, certainly, that this "long time" includes some part of 344, but the words would admit the other construction. Constantius, in his first letter, invited Athanasius fearlessly to come into his presence, rhetorically described the places of his Western sojourn as "wildernesses," and professed, with a transparent attempt to preserve his dignity, that this grace, on his part, was altogether self-suggested, and even that he had written to Constans, asking *him* to permit Athanasius's eastward journey. Another letter, written from Edessa in this same year 345, briefly directed Athanasius to make use of "the public conveyances" (or *cursus publicus*): this letter was despatched by the hands of one of Athanasius's presbyters, recalled from Armenian exile. One more letter was written after a longer interval, and brought by the deacon Achitas to Athanasius at Aquileia. His slowness in acting on Constantius's invitations is somewhat surprising; it would have been worthier of him, one is tempted to think, to have shown more confidence, and acted more boldly; but, for whatever reason, his misgivings were not removed until early in 346. He then visited Rome, and was cordially welcomed by Julius, who wrote a beautiful letter of congratulation to the Alexandrians on their recovery of their pastor, now "returning to them, after all his trials, more illustrious than when he went away. It delights me," he proceeded, "to imagine the multitudinous greetings, the glorious festivity which will make your hearts glad, on the day of my brother's return!" The good and

generous Pope added that he too had a personal joy like theirs, as having been permitted to become acquainted with so eminent a man; and concluded by praying that the Alexandrians' noble confession in the righteous cause might be rewarded with those better things which "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard." Few documents of the fourth century are more touching, or exhibit their author in a more attractive aspect, than this letter of Julius of Rome. Athanasius travelled into Gaul to take leave of Constans, who perhaps accompanied him on his journey south as far as the Italian frontier. At Hadrianople the returning exile saw the graves of the ten slaughtered Catholics in front of the city. At Antioch, he at last had another interview with Constantius, who, although he was at Constantinople for most part of 346, probably paid a short visit to Antioch about midsummer. The Emperor was in his most gracious mood; the archbishop maintained a grave self-respect, which must have seemed far from courtly. He made no complaint of inferior agents of "Eusebian" malignity, but insisted on referring to what Constantius himself had done. "Let me confront the accusers on whom you relied: I am ready to meet them." Constantius would not hear of it. "I will cause all previous charges against you to be effaced from the public records: God knows I will never again listen to any such. This is my fixed purpose; set your mind at rest on the matter. There is, however, one thing that I will request of you, in return for my favour. Let one of your many churches in Alexandria be given up to those who cannot join your communion." With his characteristic readiness Athanasius answered, "You have the power to order; but I also may as reasonably ask, that one church in Antioch may be given up to those who cannot worship with Leontius." The Emperor would have agreed to this, but his Arian advisers persuaded him to drop the negotiation. Sozomen thinks they perceived that they could gain nothing at Alexandria, and might lose much at Antioch. In fact, Athanasius's presence in Antioch had embarrassed Leontius, and encouraged the "Eustathians," who, as we have seen, had kept up their worship apart. In the "golden Church," many Catholics prayed and sang along with the Arianizers, but the forms of doxology varied: one part of the congregation ascribed glory to the Father "through the Son, in the Holy Spirit," while others said, "and to the Son" or "with the Son," and "with the Holy Spirit." Such variations were no novelty. St. Polycarp in his dying prayer had used "through" and also "with;" Dionysius

of Alexandria had used "and;" while Julius had recently used "through," and Athanasius seems to have used "through" more frequently than "with." Thirty years later, Basil said that the form "with" had been handed down to him as supported by venerable authorities; he himself had used it both in regard to the Son and to the Holy Spirit, although he had also used "through" and "in," and he defended "and" as warranted by the baptismal formula. Leontius on this occasion, with characteristic wariness, slurred over the critical words, and only just raised his voice at "world without end," literally, "unto ages of ages." It should be observed that "As it was in the beginning, so now and ever (be it)," was not in the original form. The fire of Catholic faith and devotion was kept up in the cathedral congregation by two laymen, Flavian and Diodore, who simply gave themselves up to the task, and inspirited their brethren by establishing the antiphonal chant of the psalms in the church of Antioch. They were intensely and unmistakably in earnest, and Leontius durst not interfere with them; yet Athanasius felt bound to hold aloof from them, and from all who held communion with the bishop; and we can well imagine the exultation with which the Eustathian remnant, itself considerable in point of numbers as of zeal, would see the great confessor entering the private house where they met, and joining in the services—an act on his part which had momentous results in the after-history of the "Antiochene schism." He left Antioch after a short visit, letters being at the same time sent by Constantius to various classes and personages in Egypt. The bishops and clergy were informed that all judgments passed against them on Athanasius's account were now to be cancelled, and that to be in communion with him was even to be deemed a proof of loyalty. The laity of Alexandria, who, Constantius wrote, had been for a long time without a bishop's presence, were bidden to welcome Athanasius, and profit by his intercessions with God. The prefect of Egypt, and the governors subordinate to him, were commanded to erase all that was found in their order-books "tending to the injury" of Athanasius and his people; and Constantius also directed that the highly valued privilege of immunity from onerous municipal or "curial" offices should be restored to the Athanasian clergy. The archbishop was welcomed at the maritime city of Laodicea in Syria by a young Reader of the Church, Apollinaris; he and his Alexandrian-born father were highly educated, and their keen love for

the brilliant Hellenic literature had brought them, years before, into a painful collision with their bishop Theodotus, who had put them under public censure for listening to the recitation, by a Greek sophist, of a hymn in honour of Bacchus, and had only absolved them after full proof of their sorrow. The young Apollinaris (for both had the same name) now drew on himself another church-sentence from his present bishop, the Arian George, for his enthusiastic reception of Athanasius, on whom George would look with the bitter enmity of one who had been degraded for heresy by Alexander. From Laodicea Athanasius proceeded to Jerusalem, where a Council was held, without the sanction of the metropolitan of Cæsarea, but in virtue of the honorary precedency of Bishop Maximus, and thus with the result of furnishing a sort of precedent for the independence of the see of Jerusalem, which, as we shall see, was not secured until 451. And here nearly all the bishops of Palestine did what could be done towards repairing the mischief wrought by that unhappy Council of Jerusalem which, eleven years before, had recognised Arius as orthodox. This new assembly gave its cordial greeting to Athanasius, and sent a letter to his suffragans, and his clergy and laity, congratulating them on his restoration as a marvellous answer to their prayers, and professing to be united with them by the common tie of affection for him. Sixteen prelates, Maximus being first, signed the letter; others, who were absent, wrote to Athanasius, excusing their former unfriendliness. He set forward once more. On reaching Pelusium, he warned the people against Arian craft; according to Socrates, he performed ordinations in some churches not belonging to the Alexandrian diocese—or, as it would then be called, "parish"—and "thus originated another complaint" against him; but the ample powers of the Alexandrian see render this latter statement doubtful.

And now it only remained for him to enjoy with his people the day which had been so glowingly anticipated by Julius; it was on the 24th of Paophi, or 21st of October, that his second return took place, A.D. 346. The picture of such a scene drawn by Gregory Nazianzen, and connected by him with a third return in 362, seems to belong more probably to this. He shows us, as it were, the vast masses of people streaming out from Alexandria in majestic procession, regularly divided into their several orders, to meet their archbishop at some distance from the city; the eyes gazing eagerly from every rising ground for a glimpse of the well-known diminutive figure with the noble "angelic face," the ears

strained to catch his first greetings, the voices rising in rapturous plaudits, the hands clapped in delight, the air fragrant with incense; the city, from Sun-gate to Moon-gate, north and south, and throughout its whole circuit of some fifteen miles, one blaze of festal illumination; doubtless also the churches of Theonas, of Dionysius, of Quirinus, and the Baucalis church itself, crowded with thankful worshippers as soon as Athanasius was actually in Alexandria. It was a day such as leaves an ineffaceable impression of splendour, triumph, and happiness; and long afterwards, the Alexandrians used to say of any magnificent pageant, "It is like the day when Pope Athanasius came home!" But better worth recording, as Athanasius and his friends felt—for it is this that is dwelt upon in the "Arian History"—was the moral fruit of all this exuberant enthusiasm; the congregations encouraging each other in good works; many, young and old, embodying their thankfulness in exceptional and absolute self-devotion, giving themselves up "to care for the things of the Lord" in consecrated celibacy and "self-discipline,"—or, in married life, and in families, throwing their whole souls into prayer or active charities, and making their "houses seem like churches;" and amid all this outburst of piety and earnestness, which proved that the "glorious festival" had done a solid work on souls, and had manifoldly raised the moral and religious tone of the community, the archbishop, as Gregory tells us, might be seen doing the work of a peacemaker, and gently and generously accepting the repentance of old opponents. Some, indeed, of those who had been scared into conformity with Arians came by night to entreat his pardon; "they had always been faithful in their hearts!" There were, of course, some necessary substitutions of orthodox bishops for Arians, which Athanasius had to execute with all speed. In one or two cases, he allowed a bishop who had "returned to Church unity," probably from Meletianism, to hold rank along with the regular bishop of the place; and it is interesting to find that the regular and long-desired absolution of Arsenius now took place, and he was confirmed in his bishopric at Hypsele. From abroad, there flowed in a multitude of letters fraternal and congratulatory; and Valens and Ursacius, having, as we have seen already, renounced Arianism at the recent Council of Milan, wrote from Aquileia to Athanasius with cool impertinence as their "beloved brother," and desired him to write back to them; "for know that we are at peace with you, and in communion with the Church." They also

"went up to Rome"—of their own free will, as Hosius afterwards declared—but apparently from a desire to propitiate their sovereign Constans, and in presence of Julius and his presbyters subscribed a recantation to this effect: "We have laid many charges against Athanasius by letter: you, Pope Julius, wrote to rebuke us, and we could not justify ourselves; we here confess that those charges were all false; we desire to be in communion with Athanasius, since we have now been pardoned by you; but if he or any Eastern bishops should call us to account for this matter, we will not attend without your sanction. We repeat our renunciation of Arianism made at Milan, and will abide by it." The Latin original of this document (which has been thought spurious, but seems rather to have an air of genuineness, especially in the expression of uneasiness as to future proceedings) was sent to Athanasius by Paulinus, bishop of Treves as one version reads it, but more probably of Tibur. We are also told that afterwards, two priests of Alexandria, and a layman without any instructions from Athanasius, presented "letters of peace" to Valens and Ursacius, which they signed—being ready at that time to sign anything. Having thus sufficiently abased themselves, they were, it appears, received into communion by another Council of Milan representing many provinces, and principally occupied with the business of Photinus, whom it condemned but could not dislodge.

Here, then, amid the "deep and wondrous peace" which Athanasius enjoyed for nearly ten years, we may, as having reached a landmark, pause awhile in the Arian history.

II.

Let us turn, then, in the first instance, to another and very different scene, which, in a distant field of the Church's work, was recalling the memories of the age of martyrdom.

For historical purposes, we may neglect the legend about Thaddæus, one of the Seventy, being sent by St. Thomas to Abgar, king of Edessa, according to a local account preserved by Eusebius, and connected with a fabulous correspondence between Abgar and our Lord. The church of Edessa seems to have originated in the second century; and then the story of an Apostolic mission might grow up. But the names of Adai and Maris, associated with the oldest "East Syrian" liturgy, may represent the fact as to the first preaching of Christianity in Eastern Mesopotamia, whence it was

carried into Persia. There were, in the second century, many Christians in Persia who refrained from the lawless marriages sanctioned by Persian law. We do not know that their position was at all affected by the overthrow of the Parthian monarchy, and the restoration of the Persian in the Sassanid kings, a hundred years before the Nicene Council; and we are told that Manes or Mani, in his earlier days, before he became the founder of a new and thoroughly unchristian system, had adopted Christianity, and had even acted as priest in the Persian Church. In 309, three years before the overthrow of Maxentius by Constantine, Sapor II., the "Long-lived," began at once his life and reign; and as he grew up to manhood, he became bent on wresting back from the Romans those "five provinces to the north and east of the Tigris," which Rome had acquired after the campaign of 297. But it was perilous to try conclusions with "the Victorious" Constantine. John, a Persian bishop, was permitted, as it appears, to attend the Nicene Council; and Sapor sent envoys with friendly messages to Constantine, who learned from these two sources that there were many churches in Persia, and that "multitudes of people were being gathered into the fold of Christ." Thereupon, about 332, Constantine resolved to address Sapor in favour of the Persian Christians. His letter, preserved by Eusebius, begins with the emphatic declaration, "It is by preserving faith in God that I enjoy the light of truth." In his usual style of didactic and self-complacent rhetoric, but also with remarkable adaptation of his topics to his intended reader, Constantine descants on the hatefulness of sanguinary sacrifices, on the divine approval of pure hearts and virtuous lives, of gentleness, of forbearance, on the wretched fate of the persecutor Valerian, whom, he says, "God's vengeance gave over to your country;" then, after referring to the ruin of more recent heathen tyrants, he comes to the point by expressing his satisfaction at the prosperity of the Christians under Sapor, and commending them to his "brother's benignant" care. This letter is quite incompatible with Sozomen's supposition that a persecution of Persian Christians had then begun: we must rather say that they were, at any rate, not seriously disturbed until several years later. The peace between Rome and Persia was not broken until after the death of Constantine; but Sapor saw his opportunity in the partition of the Roman sovereignty, and early in 338 the Persians were compelled to raise the siege of the strong frontier city of Nisibis, which had long been esteemed the Eastern

"bulwark" of the empire. Then, as in two later sieges, which the city sustained in 346 and 350, and the last of which continued for a hundred days, James its bishop, who had sat in the Nicene Council, upheld its resistance by his lofty faith and courage. Thus the Persian king would learn but too easily to associate Christianity with the cause of Rome, and to suspect his Christian subjects of disaffection. The Magian priests would know how to work upon his uneasiness. They persuaded him to impose excessive taxes on the Christians, although many of the latter had embraced voluntary poverty: the collectors were rigorous, and much distress ensued. The next step was to destroy churches, and confiscate sacred vessels. As a third measure, bishops and clergy were imprisoned; and many a Christian, seeing a reign of terror setting in, was scared into dissembling his belief. After several such preludes to a regular persecution, Symeon Barsabœ ("son of the Leather-seller"), the primate of the Persian Church, bishop of the two adjacent royal cities of Seleucia and Ctesiphon, was denounced —according to Sozomen, who had full information, by Jewish residents—as a traitor who had not only protested against the oppressive taxation of Christians, but was wont to give information to Constantine respecting the plans of the "Great King." He was led in chains before Sapor, probably, says Ruinart, in the April of 345. The place was Ledan in Huzitis. He pointedly omitted the usual ceremony of prostration, which Alexander and Diocletian had borrowed from Oriental palace-chambers, and which was perpetuated through ages at the Cæsarean court. "Why do you not prostrate yourself," asked Sapor, "as you used to do?" Symeon answered boldly, "I did so when I was not put in chains to make me betray my God, and when therefore I might freely do homage to my king." Sapor bade him, at least, adore the sun, promising riches and honour if he complied, menacing him with death, and with destruction of all Christians, if he were obstinate. He was immovable, and, together with two old priests, was remanded to prison. Passing forth at the palace-gate, he saw sitting there, like Mordecai of old, a Christian of high rank, arrayed in splendid attire. This was his friend Usthazanes, chief officer of the palace, and foster-father of Sapor, who had lately, under severe pressure, consented to worship the sun. He rose at the bishop's approach, and, as he had doubtless been wont to do in happier times, bowed reverently before him. Symeon uttered a few words of stern reproach, and turned his face away. Usthazanes burst into tears,

exchanged his rich garments for black, and sat down again at the gate, groaning bitterly: "Woe is me! what can I expect from the God whom I denied, if for His sake my old friend thus disowns me!" Sapor heard of his sudden grief, sent for him, and asked if any evil had befallen his house. "Would that it had!" cried his foster-father. "Why do I live—why do I behold the sun, to which I paid a guilty worship, betraying Christ and deceiving you? But I protest, by the Creator of all things, that I now take my side, once for all, as a Christian." "This is Christian magic," said Sapor, who had a true regard for Usthazanes: he tried alternately severity and kindness, in order to bend his resolution; all was in vain, and Sapor at last ordered him to be beheaded. It was Maundy Thursday. Usthazanes begged one moment of respite, which his guards granted; he then sent a message to Sapor: "O king, my loyalty to your father and yourself needs no proof: in return for it, I ask one boon. Cause it to be proclaimed that Usthazanes dies, not for any offence committed in his office, but only for being a Christian, and refusing to deny his own God at the king's order." Sapor granted the request, in hopes of terrifying the Christians by such a proof that mere persistency in Christianity, or in rejection of the sun-worship, was a capital crime, even in the person of one so dear to him. The bishop in his prison heard that, as in several other pathetic and cheering cases in the history of martyrdom, a temporary apostasy had been thus gloriously redressed; he thanked God, and doubtless came forth all the more tranquil and joyous, next morning, to be once again questioned by Sapor. He declared that he would worship neither the king nor the sun. He was condemned to die, with a hundred other imprisoned confessors. They were all led out on the Crucifixion morning; all refused the chief Magian's offer of mercy at the last moment, on condition of doing the king's will; Symeon stood by while each in turn received the death-stroke, speaking to them of the true life to which a death for God would be the entrance, of the great account, and the eternal future. He suffered with his two priests, one of whom, Ananias, an old man, trembled visibly as the moment drew near. Pusices, the superintendent of the king's works, stood near and encouraged him: "Shut your eyes for one moment, and be of good courage; you will speedily see God's own light!" The speaker was at once arrested, and dragged before Sapor; he owned himself a Christian, and spoke boldly of the Christians' innocence; he was punished by a death of special pain, his tongue

being torn out before life was extinct. "The sword," we are told, "never rested in its work for ten days, until the second Sunday of the second week of the Pentecostal period," *i.e.* our first Sunday after Easter; and in the following year, when Good Friday came round, an edict appeared, dooming to death all who should own themselves Christians. Many fled into places of hiding, and the Magians hunted them down with relentless eagerness; others came forward to profess their belief, lest by silence they should seem to deny it; and great numbers suffered martyrdom. One of the most famous cases in this terrible Persian persecution was that of Tarbula or Pherbutha, a dedicated virgin, sister of Symeon, who with her sister and her servant, both women of devoted lives, was seized on the charge of having avenged Symeon's blood by bringing on the queen, through magical arts, the disease from which she then suffered. This was a Jewish calumny, and the queen, a proselyte to Judaism, gave it credence. The three women were sawn asunder, and the halves of their corpses were fastened to three large stakes on each side of the place of execution. "To break the spell," said the Magians, "the queen must pass between them;" and this ghastly scene is referred to April or May, 346. A chamberlain of the palace, named Azadas, was put to death without Sapor's personal knowledge; and the king, who "loved him," by a new edict restricted the persecution to the teachers of Christianity. Among those teachers who were martyred may be mentioned Symeon's successor in the Seleucian bishopric, Sadoth or Chahdoust, who, with a hundred and twenty-eight companions, was imprisoned for five months, and repeatedly tortured. All but Sadoth were led together to execution; he was beheaded in another district, about a year after Symeon's martyrdom; and an aged bishop, Acepsimus, was imprisoned for three years, and finally beaten to death. We need not at present look farther into a series of inflictions which lasted, with some intermissions, until the death of Sapor in 380. Seldom has any national Church been exposed to so severe a trial of faith and patience; it is difficult for the imagination to picture to itself the merest outlines of what has been called, with but little exaggeration, the Forty Years' Persecution. But, from its earliest portion, some features stand out in such distinctness as cannot be surpassed in the records of Christian endurance: beside the Great King himself, perverted into the most obstinate of persecutors by fanatical zeal for his national worship, by affronted royal pride, and by a conviction that Christians must be traitors—or his wretched

wife, goaded by suffering into a barbarous credulity—we seem to see the high-hearted primate setting an example of true constancy; the old court servant seduced for a while into apostasy, and reclaimed by timely rebuke for a martyr's crown; the dauntless layman sustaining the old priest's courage at the critical moment, and the three holy women adjudged, by a specially odious calumny, to a death of unique torture. Enough has been said to show what was the condition of the Christians in the farther East in the period just following upon the Council of Sardica, while on the central stage of Church life the Catholic cause was emerging into somewhat of rest and sunshine. Let us now turn our thoughts into an opposite quarter, and look at the condition of the African Church in presence of its obstinate local schism.

III.

At the time of the Sardican Council, some thirty years had elapsed since the Donatist movement, or, as it was then called, the "pars Majorini," had sprung out of a stern zeal against alleged unfaithfulness in time of persecution—a zeal which might most emphatically be called "not according to knowledge," boiling to fever-heat in dogged and vehement African natures, refusing to be corrected either by charity or by justice, but not disdaining to co-operate with such base elements as petty vindictiveness and baffled ambition. The contention of the new sectarians was a definite and unvarying one: "Cæcilian was not legitimately bishop of Carthage, because Felix his consecrator had been a Traditor—had surrendered certain copies of Scripture in the beginning of the Great Persecution. The only true bishop of Carthage was Majorinus, who had been consecrated in order to provide Carthage with a bishop whose commission was untainted; and Cæcilian himself was not, as the apostolic rule required, 'blameless,' for he had formerly shown great unkindness to imprisoned Christians during the persecution." Constantine had early been called upon by the adherents of Majorinus to have the case judicially examined. Since that appeal, which took place in April, 313, five investigations had been made—by the Council of Rome in October of that year; by the proconsul Ælianus at Carthage, when the charge against Felix was proved to rest on forgery; by the Council of Arles in August, 314; by Constantine in his cabinet council at Milan in November, 316; and by the "consular" Zenophilus, who had to

receive an accusation against Silvanus of Cirta, in 320. All these trials, says Gibbon, "were favourable to the cause of Cæcilian:" "perhaps," he adds with his wonted cynicism, the question "was determined with justice;" but on that point, the extant evidence as to his opponents assuredly leaves no doubt. Of their odious temper,—violent and arrogant almost to the point of frenzy, pertinacious in the face of damning facts, as Augustine says of the party, "toties mendax, toties confutata," contemptuous of all but partisan interests, illustrating, as we may say with such tragical vividness, the Apostolic description of schism as "carnal,"—we have such proof as to make it difficult to read the Donatist history with patience, or to believe that there were any really good men among the adversaries of Cæcilian. And yet in so large a body there must have been some whose chief fault lay in partisan credulity, and whose chief object was to keep the Church of Christ, at a time full of secularising influences, true to herself and to her Head, loyal, strict, devoted, pure.

The exile of the Donatist leaders, including the more famous of the two who bore the name of Donatus, *i.e.* Donatus "the Great," who succeeded Majorinus in his episcopate at Carthage, continued five years or thereabouts, and came to an end, from Constantine's weariness at their importunity, three years before the Nicene Council. Their recall had given them fresh opportunities for consolidating their party. Donatus of Carthage, as his admirers preferred to call him, without employing the ordinary title of bishop, was eminently qualified to act as their head; and from him, rather than from his elder namesake, the party chiefly derived its name. He was able, eloquent, learned, and of blameless personal conduct; but his pride of office and position amounted almost to insanity, and was afterwards compared by Optatus—who wrote about A.D. 370—to the self-exaltation of the "prince of Tyre" depicted by Ezekiel. He treated the other bishops of his party as his vassals and creatures, hardly deigning, it was said, to "partake of their oblations," *i.e.* to communicate at their hands. He allowed, at least he did not forbid, his adherents to swear by his name: St. Augustine says that "by the white hair of Donatus" became a common Donatist oath. He also, it seems, accepted without reluctance their exclamations of "Well done, good leader, noble leader!" and Optatus censures him because, when any Donatists came to Carthage, he did not ask them the common questions about the rain or crops, or the peace of their district, but (as if he had

no time or thought for such "small talk") put the question to each, "How is *my* party getting on where you live?" It was not, says Optatus, the cause of Christ—the Church—that was the apparent subject of his thoughts, but what he did not shrink from calling "his party." At the same time he must be supposed to have habitually regarded "his party" as the true Church of Christ; and he wrote a letter to prove that in it alone was true Christian baptism—a position which, before he became the "leader," had been practically carried out by rebaptizing any churchmen who joined the schism. He also wrote a book on the Holy Spirit, in which he showed a disposition to Arianize. Under his presidency the sect gathered strength: it was bold enough to appropriate a church built by Constantine for the Catholics of Cirta; and the Emperor ordered a new basilica to be erected for them on another site. A law of his in 330 shows that its influence had wrongfully imposed "curial" burdens on some Catholic "readers" and subdeacons; it became popular, respectable, imposing; and many applicants for admission to its communion acknowledged themselves to have been "Traditors," but objected to being rebaptized. These cases were dealt with about A.D. 330 by a great Council of two hundred and seventy Donatist bishops, which sat for seventy-five days, and after much deliberation excused such persons from receiving a fresh baptism; but, as Tillemont expresses it, "the Donatists did not by any means hold to this decree." About the same time, perhaps, the party extended its operations by establishing a little schismatic bishopric outside the walls of Rome, for a small knot of African residents; the first occupant of it was Victor of Garbia. He had no following among the Roman Christians; he was obliged to establish himself on a hill outside the city—perhaps the Janiculan—and there to hold his services in a cave which he had fenced with hurdles. This spot was to the Donatist conventicle at Rome—called from this circumstance the Montensians or Hill-folk—all that the basilicas on the Lateran or the Vatican, wherein no Donatist would set his foot, were to the great community which worshipped in some forty churches, adhered to the "Cathedra Petri," and regarded it as the most eminent symbol of the unity of the Church.

As we have already seen, the famous Western Council, which paid such careful observance to the dignity of the "see of Peter," included among its members the successor of Cæcilian—Gratus, bishop of Carthage. This had led the seceders at Philippopolis to address their synodal letter to Donatus, his rival, among other

bishops on whose friendship they might count. Little or nothing came of this overture so far as the Arian interest was concerned, for if Donatus himself was unsound, while not denying the Homoousion—that is, as Augustine expressed it, if he personally held "that the Son, though of the same substance with the Father, was yet inferior to Him, and the Spirit inferior to the Son"—this advanced "subordinationism" of their chief teacher did not make its way into the minds of his adherents. But they did make use of the Eastern bishops' letter, as proving that the East disowned the "Traditors'" apostasy, and recognised *their* body as the African Church. On the other hand, Gratus appears to have taken the opportunity, as he returned home by Italy, of paying a visit to the Emperor Constans, for a purpose which, sensitive as he was on the scandal of needless journeyings to court, he would represent to himself as just and necessary. The Emperor would do a good work, he pleaded, if he would send alms to the poor Christians of Africa; and this generous charity on the part of a Catholic monarch might have the further good result of winning back to the Church not a few who were now in schism. Constans readily entered into the plan, and sent two imperial commissioners, Paul and Macarius, charged with gifts from himself to all African Christians. The sum was very large—a "treasure," as Optatus describes it, out of which the poor in every district might have been "relieved, fed, clothed, and made happy." The commissioners, in distributing it, made no distinction between churchmen and sectarians: it was, indeed, one object of their mission to try the effect of kindness on sectarian animosity; they only coupled their dole, in the case of Donatists, by exhortations to return to Catholic unity. Everything was done gently and persuasively; indeed, to have acted otherwise would have contravened the very purpose of their coming. They addressed themselves to Gratus's lordly rival, and explained the Emperor's wish to befriend the poor members of both communions. Donatus, who a few years before had not hesitated to write to Gregory, prætorian prefect of Italy, as the "disgrace of the senate and of his order," now thought fit to show the Emperor's agents how little he, "Donatus of Carthage," the most powerful man in the African capital, cared for any missive from a prince. "What has the Emperor to do with the Church?" he demanded, in forgetfulness or disregard of the repeated memorials which his party had showered on the father of Constans; and, as if in sheer recklessness, he

bestowed some bitter epithets on Constans himself. The commissioners kept their temper, and calmly said, "Well, we shall go through the various provinces, and distribute supplies to any who will receive them." "I have already written," he rejoined, "to prevent my people from taking anything at your hand;" he would doubtless feel, if he did not say, that the gifts were intended to bribe them into conformity; and if we may here refer to the Donatist "sermon on the harassing of the party" at some period of Cæcilian's episcopate, it might be some justification of Donatus's violent language that this was not the first occasion on which the government had attempted to "take faith captive," as the Donatist writer expresses it, by means of money.

But the party had an engine of resistance, the power of which its leaders knew too well. Tumultuary reprisals in the form of outrages on individual Catholics by Donatists had, as early as 317, called forth the horror and pity of Constantine. They were probably perpetuated by the wild bands of fanatic peasants, who commonly gained their living by begging from one hut or cell to another, and hence acquired the name of Circumcellions. They were originally social malcontents, enemies of "capital" and proprietorship as such, and ready to side with the Donatists as "the disaffected party in Church and State." Even when paganism was in full power, such men had courted death by violently interrupting a rural sacrifice; they were just as ready to rush, in the cause of the "pure Church," on "adherents of Traditors," although with the prospect of slaying rather than of being slain. And yet again, some years later, but before the arrival of Paul and Macarius, these "madmen," as they are often described, had proclaimed war, in grotesque but savage fashion, against property in the name of religion: headed by Maxido and Fasir, whom they styled "Leaders of the Saints," they had scared creditors into abandonment of their claims, beset the highways, dragged masters out of their carriages and forced them to change places with their slaves, and altogether made themselves such a pest that the very Donatist prelates whom they professed to acknowledge had to invoke the government against them, and Count Taurinus had put many of them to death at a Numidian town, where long afterwards their white gravestones were understood to claim for them the honours of martyrdom. Such was the force now called out by another Donatus, schismatic bishop of Bagai, to prevent the commissioners from entering his city. He gave them the proud

name of "Agonistici," or Combatants for God. One can realise, by help of some passages of St. Augustine, what these Circumcellions looked like, what they shouted, how they rushed on—thick swarms of dark-faced barbarians, armed with huge clubs which they called "Israels," and thundering forth their war-cry of "Praises to God!" a shout more dreaded than the roar of a lion, and probably adopted in opposition to the Catholic watchword, "Thanks to God!" A collision followed when Paul and Macarius, for mere safety's sake, procured soldiers from the Count Silvester: at first the Roman horsemen, who came on in front, were repulsed, and then the soldiers, exasperated, fell on the fanatics, and put a small number of them to the sword. Thus was the peaceful aspect of the scheme for Reunion irretrievably darkened; and the Donatists, who on this occasion lost two of their bishops, Donatus of Bagai, and a prelate of some learning and religious reputation named Marculus, immediately canonized them as martyrs, although there was some suspicion, justified by the after-history of Donatist fanaticism, that they were, in fact, suicides. Blood had at any rate been spilt; the Agonistici had been cut down by the soldiers brought against them by the "operarii unitatis;" it was a new persecution of the faithful. Such was the language held by the schismatics, who for years continued to denounce the memory of "the time of Macarius," to implicate him personally in the whole guilt of the slaughter of Bagai, and in the subsequent "martyrdom" of two other Donatists, Isaac and Maximian, one of whom, it is said, died in prison after many inflictions, and the other was cast into the sea: a narrative which Tillemont suspects as possibly invented by the Donatists, but which may record some actual cruelty into which the government was provoked by obstinate fanaticism. It is needless to add that the schismatics held the Church answerable for all that Macarius or the soldiers did; and doubtless, although in fact the Catholic bishops were not either directly or indirectly parties to the proceeding, it was natural for incensed followers of Donatus to see their hand in the edict which banished the Donatist chiefs, and enforced that "Union" which could not be effected by persuasion. Macarius, who now entered, as Optatus acknowledges, on a rigorous course, would naturally justify it to his master on the ground that mildness had been met by perverse obstinacy, which, from an imperial point of view, would look like sedition; and as the original plan had aimed at promoting simple conformity through material assistance, we may presume that

the prospect of many insincere professions of Churchmanship did not greatly disquiet either Macarius himself, or the clergy in whose interest, although on his own responsibility, the repressive policy of 317–320 was again put in force. When the Union was to be inaugurated by a solemn celebration of the Eucharist in the cathedral of Carthage, there was an attempt to stir up religious panic. "It is a restoration of paganism that is coming upon us, under the guise of Union! Paul and Macarius will attend the sacrifice; and when the altar is prepared, they will set an image upon it, and so have the sacrifice changed into idolatry. Christians, beware! Whoso tastes of this sacrifice, to be offered in ratification of the Union, tastes of a thing offered to an idol!" But many who came to the service were much relieved by finding that there was "nothing to shock the eye or the ear of a Christian: there was only a pure worship, with the orderly ritual duly observed, and nothing changed," as Optatus expresses it, "by addition or by omissiom, in the offering of the sacrifice to God." Thus many who had been schismatics were induced to "welcome the peace which seemed now to have a Divine sanction." Macarius, indeed, was present, and communicated, and made an address to the people, by way of explaining the object for which the "Union" had been established; but he did not, we are carefully told, assume the tone of a preacher, nor begin and end his speech with the wonted episcopal form of salutation. The result of these proceedings was naturally a large reinforcement of the numbers of the African Church: various motives, of course, impelled various persons to accept the Union, and many must have retained in heart the sectarianism which they thought it prudent to abjure. Among the new conformists were several Donatist bishops. Of the imposing schismatic hierarchy which some years before had sat in council on the question of receiving repentant Traditors, nothing was now to be seen on the stage of African Christianity; the Donatist services were proscribed, and no communion lifted its head in rivalry with that of which Gratus was the chief pastor. He was thus able to hold a Council of the whole African Church at Carthage, some time apparently between 345 and 348. It ranks as the first Council of Carthage, although, taking into account those of the preceding century—the one held under Agrippinus, and the seven under St. Cyprian—it would be reckoned as the ninth. Gratus began his address by thanksgiving to God and Christ for the close which had been put to "the evil schism," by the agency

of the most religious emperor and of his instruments in the holy work. He went on to say that this epoch of restored unity was a good time for enacting some necessary Church rules, which should avoid the extremes of laxity and rigour. "First, then, if you please, let us consider the question of rebaptization. Let your Holinesses give judgment whether a person who has once been dipped in the font, with due confession of the Trinity and in the faith of the Resurrection, may again be interrogated on his faith, and again immersed in the water." All the bishops exclaimed, "Far be it, far be it!" Gratus expressed his satisfaction, and passed on to another point, which had been of great importance in the very beginnings of Donatism. We have seen that Mensurius, and Cæcilian as his archdeacon, had exerted themselves—the Donatists said, with great harshness—to discountenance the intemperate zeal of persons who, instead of waiting to be interrogated by a heathen magistrate, came forward of their own motion to declare themselves Christians, and rushed precipitately, so to speak, on that death which such a self-surrender naturally entailed. The moderate party in Africa, following St. Cyprian's judgment rather than Tertullian's, had always regarded such an act as presumptuous, and declined to acknowledge as martyrs those who thus provoked the government to shed their blood. This view was denounced by the Donatist fanatics as a scandalous insult to Christ's triumphant athletes, and a transparent veil for poor-spirited disloyalty. Gratus, therefore, was touching one of the vital points at issue when, with a cautious and modest preface, as one who was but a member of the episcopal body—"sharing," as he said, "the same solicitude with yourselves"—he proposed that no one, on pain of censure, should treat as martyrs those whose vehement impetuosity had really disqualified them for that august title, and who were sufficiently graced by the Church's indulgence in burying them as Christians. This second canon was also accepted by the Council; it had already, the bishops exclaimed, been passed, since the Union, in local synods. The scandal and temptation caused by the custom, still existing in some places, of clergy dwelling in the same house with women who were not their wives, was treated of in two other canons, the first of which relates particularly to the case of these "Sub-introductæ," already brought before the Ancyran, Neocæsarean, and Nicene Councils. Another bishop suggested that no bishop should receive another's cleric or laic without his leave; and Gratus approved, adding, "I remember that in the holy Council

of Sardica it was ordained that no one should take possession of a man belonging to another flock,"— alluding to the fifteenth Sardican canon, which, however, did not warrant the extension of the prohibition to the case of laics. He summed up the proceedings by proposing to include in the resolutions of this Council the statutes of other councils, and the whole body of existing Church law, and by calling on his brethren to sign the Council-record.

So ended the proceedings connected with the "union" of Donatists and Catholics: an event which gave the Church of Africa about sixteen years of external peace, but which was far enough from really healing the schism, or quenching the forces which were sullenly and determinately abiding their time for a fresh explosion, and whose extent was tragically manifest when Julian's edict in favour of the Donatist exiles gave an opportunity for the reorganization of the sect, and opened a new scene of fanatical outrages and sternly repressive penal laws.

CHAPTER XII.

THE SECOND ARIAN PERSECUTION.

THE course of the Church in her contest with Arianism, while her cause was impersonated in "Athanasius the Great," may be likened to a dangerous mountain-path, diversified at intervals by plateaux of "large room" on whose ample levels the wearied feet might rest, and the eyes freely look around, reviewing the extent that had been traversed, and calculating, in some sort, the measure of exertions that must follow. One such resting-place had already been granted, for a short time, after the first return of Athanasius in 338, on the termination of his sojourn at Treves. Another and, as it might be called, a still more refreshing intermission of toils was obtained in the "deep and wondrous peace" which succeeded his second return, eight years later, in the autumn of 346. To this tranquil period may be referred the foundation of an organized Church in Ethiopia, otherwise Habesh or Abyssinia, which in those days extended across the Straits of Bab el Mandeb into Southern Arabia. We owe the story to information received by Rufinus, the sometime friend of Jerome, from a priest named Ædesius, the brother of its hero. True, Ædesius said that the main event took place when Athanasius had "recently become bishop:" but a mention of the Ethiopic Church and its chief pastor in a subsequent work of Athanasius suggests a later date, and Ædesius, in his old age, might have confused the time just preceding Athanasius's worst troubles with the earliest part of his career. It was then, we may say, about 350 that Athanasius was sitting in synod with his suffragans, or some of them, when a stranger craved an audience. He gave his name as Frumentius, and said he had come from Ethiopia, which was then also known as "Interior India;" and his narrative was "stranger than fiction." He and his brother Ædesius were Christians born at Tyre; many years before, as boys,

they had accompanied a kinsman named Meropius, a "philosopher" or scientific inquirer, on a journey to the far south, on which he had entered after hearing the account of the travels of another philosopher named Metrodorus—the date of whose return is thus an element in the case, and is placed by Valesius in 325, but some twenty years earlier by Tillemont, who accepts the early date of the story. The two brothers were on their way home when their vessel touched a port in the Red Sea; they two alone had escaped death at the hands of the barbarous natives, and after being sold as slaves to the king of the country, whose capital was Auxume or Axum, had grown up as his confidential servants. After his death Frumentius had been made guardian of his son, or rather of his two sons Aizan and Sazan; in that office, he had done his utmost to provide places of worship for Christian traders resident in Ethiopia, and to spread Christian ideas among the native population. When the guardianship came naturally to an end, the queen and her son had begged the brothers to remain in Ethiopia; but they had returned to the Roman world—Ædesius hastening to the old home at Tyre, while Frumentius, with the noble words, "It is not right to hide the Lord's work," repaired to Alexandria, to entreat that a missionary bishop might be sent to the country which he had learned to serve and love. Athanasius looked full at the petitioner, and borrowing the words of Pharaoh concerning Joseph, said, "And whom can we find so fit for that work as yourself—a man in whom the Spirit of God is?" The other prelates assented, and Frumentius received consecration, returned to Ethiopia, fixed his see at Axum, was supported in his mission by the royal house which he had upheld in its time of weakness, and so laboured as to earn the name of "Father Salama, who kindled in Ethiopia the splendour of the light of Christ."

But to return to the scenes of religious strife. There were matters connected with attacks on orthodoxy outside the general line of Arian hostilities, which might sufficiently remind all thoughtful Churchmen that they must not dream of any permanent rest from the burden of vigilance or the stress of warfare. We need not, apparently, include in these subjects of anxiety the alleged denial of Christ's Godhead by Euphrates of Cologne, who had been one of the deputies from the Sardican Council to Constantine, and the intended victim of an infamous Arian conspiracy at the Easter of 344. The account of the condemnation of Euphrates in a Council of fourteen prelates, held at Cologne in 346,

cannot now be deemed authentic; it was never brought forward until a comparatively late period, and the silence of contemporary or other ancient authorities is rendered more impressive by the fact that, in the record, Bishop Servatius of Tongres is made to say, "I was aware of Euphrates's conduct and teaching from the circumstance of my living in a neighbouring city, and I often contradicted him, when he denied Christ to be God, in the hearing of Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria:" according to which Athanasius must have known of Euphrates's heresy while he was resident in Germany, six or seven years before the Sardican Council conferred on Euphrates the honour of being one of its delegates. The whole story looks like an Arianizer's attempt to counteract, as it were, the scandal of Stephen's detected plot against Euphrates by associating the latter with the characteristic heresy of Photinus, and making Athanasius, and his friend Maximin, and Servatius, who afterwards visited Athanasius at Alexandria, cognisant in various ways of the gross unsoundness of the Metropolitan of "Second Germany." But we must enter into the troubles which were undoubtedly distressing the Italian bishops in 347, not only from the Arianizing disposition of some of their brethren, whom it was found necessary to excommunicate, but from the persistency of Photinus of Sirmium, who, strong in natural gifts, and supported by his own people, had practically defied the sentence of the Milanese Council of 343. Another Council, therefore, probably held at Milan, promulgated a new sentence of deposition in 347: it was this assembly which, while condemning several Arianizers, appears to have formally accepted that recantation which Valens and Ursacius (as we have already seen) had tendered to the earlier Council of Milan, and which they had supplemented by a friendly letter "to Athanasius," written at Aquileia, and by a formal and explicit recantation in presence of Julius and the presbytery of Rome. They were now received into communion by the Council, in the presence, and with the assent of Julius's legates. The main object, however, of this numerous Council, the members of which are described by Hilary as "anxii," was to clear the West yet more decisively from all supposed complicity in the detested errors of the disciple of Marcellus; it was eminently necessary to show that this development, in a peculiarly offensive form, of the theories ascribed to the old friend of Athanasius and the old enemy of the Arians, met with simple rejection at the hands of the "Athanasians" of Italy. The Council accordingly communicated its

sentence against Photinus to the Eastern bishops. Some of these saw their opportunity, and held a meeting with remarkable boldness in Photinus's own city—a very important border-town in Lower Pannonia, and "the bulwark of the Illyrian provinces." This meeting, which may be dated in 348, must rank as the true "first council of Sirmium." The prelates there assembled, in their reply to the Italians, took occasion, while renewing the sentence against Photinus, to denounce Marcellus as the originator of his heresy; to say that Marcellus's acquittal at Sardica had been irregular, and obtained, so to speak, on false pretences; and to affirm that Athanasius himself had been obliged, at last, to break off communion with his former friend. This latter statement was believed by Hilary, who traced Athanasius's action to some later utterances of Marcellus; but it hardly agrees with Epiphanius's account, who says that when he himself once asked Athanasius what he thought of Marcellus, he got no answer save a quiet and yet significant smile, which he understood to mean that Athanasius "regarded Marcellus as one who had only just stopped short of heresy, and had defended himself against that charge." If Athanasius ever did suspend communion with Marcellus, it must have been for a short time only; for he seems to have regarded him with confidence as cleared of all suspicion of heresy, when he wrote, or sanctioned the writing of, the "Arian History" about ten years later. And indeed, one cannot lay much stress on a statement by Arianizing bishops as to the conduct of Athanasius towards the person whom they specially abhorred; for their object was to commit all adversaries of Photinianism to a sort of censure on Athanasius. They expressed their own belief in a short and vague creed, which could not of itself imply any heresy, but by its indistinctness could serve only to put the Westerns more than ever on their guard, and is therefore described by Hilary as "fraudulent." And thus, although East and West were agreed in reprobating Photinianism, the Arian difference still kept them apart.

So stood the great question which divided the Latin-speaking Churches from a large portion at least of the Oriental, when an event occurred which ultimately placed the East and West once more under a single throne. The Emperor Constans had not fulfilled the promise of his early years. He suffered from a painful affection of feet and hands, which took away much of his energy, and thus he fell into the hands of bad favourites, under whose

influence his character deteriorated. He never could have been great, but he had amiable qualities, and, in the equitable judgment of Ammianus, would have "committed no faults, or at any rate only venial ones, had he but been well advised." In his thirtieth year, for want of due military caution, he allowed himself to be defeated by some adherents of an insurgent general named Magnentius, and was slain by them at a town called Helene on the Gallic side of the Pyrenees, January 18, 350. Magnentius was acknowledged as Emperor by "the two great prefectures of Gaul and Italy," including Britain, Spain, and Western Africa; the usurpation of Nepotian, a "stolid" young nephew of Constantine, at Rome, lasted but for a month: for nearly a year Vetranio, a dull illiterate man who had ruled "Illyricum," including Macedonia, Greece, Epirus, Dacia, and Mœsia, was allured into the position of an imperial claimant; but Constantius, with considerable tact, induced him, late in 350, to accept ease and safety in private life, and thus had his hands free to carry on the struggle with the slayer of his brother. This was no light task, for Magnentius was a strong man, who conciliated at least some of his subjects by observing the laws, as Libanius expresses it, and others by a tolerant policy towards paganism. But Constantius defeated him at Mursa in September, 351, drove him into Gaul in 352, and finally routed his forces in the Cottian Alps in 353; whereupon Magnentius fled to Lyons, and adopted "the Roman fashion" of death.

If we ask for the first ecclesiastical consequence of these political changes, we shall find it in the opportunity given, by the annexation of Vetranio's dominions to those of Constantius, for a further movement against the indomitable bishop of Sirmium in his own city; thither Constantius, whose birthplace it was, betook himself on his way to confront his remaining rival; and there a large synod met, probably early in 351. Basil of Ancyra was there, naturally eager to push matters home against the disciple of the prelate whose seat he filled once again, in consequence of a fresh expulsion of Marcellus; for it seems that the latter's tenure of that uneasy throne had been renewed some time after 344, and again cut short, perhaps in 350. Among other prelates there were to be seen Eudoxius, Macedonius of Mopsuestia, Theodore of Heraclea, and Mark of Arethusa, with Valens and Ursacius, who had been persuaded by their old friends to return to what Athanasius calls "the mire of their impiety." It is hardly possible, however, to follow Socrates when he says that Hosius of Cordova was present

on this occasion, although "much against his will;" he was still a subject of an Emperor, or usurper, at open war with Constantius. The Council once again deposed Photinus; and it published, in the first instance, a creed, which was all but exactly identical with that which had been brought from Antioch to Constans, had been adopted at Philippopolis, and had formed the first part of the Macrostich. Then to this creed were appended, not, as before, a few anathemas, but twenty-seven, which form the characteristic of this Sirmian Confession of 351. Athanasius observes that the bishops, while they did not make their document so long as the Macrostich (which was, in fact, prolix in its comments on its seven anathemas), yet wrote new matter in the place of the larger part of the Macrostich, "as if they had listened to the suggestions of others." The first anathema had been annexed to the creed at its previous appearances, save only that, when brought to Constans, it did not condemn the position, "There was time *or age* when the Son was not," but simply, "There was time when He was not;" the evasion, "He was before all time" (which would not strictly imply eternal existence), being more distinctly, yet not quite adequately, proscribed by the later censure against those who would not say, "He was before ages," as well as "before time." Of the remaining anathemas, some are protests against all Ditheistic or Tritheistic conceptions; others disclaimed the notions imputed by thorough adherents of Nicene doctrine to even the milder form of Arianism as to the passibility of the Son's (so-called) divinity, or His derivation of being from the mere will of the true Creator; others insisted on His ministerial agency in the creation and under the patriarchal covenant, explaining, for instance, "The Lord rained fire from the Lord," of the combined operation of the Father and the Son, and excluding Ditheism on the ground, not of the coinherence, but of Filial "subjection;" others indicated a disposition to what was afterwards known as the Macedonian heresy, which separated the Holy Spirit from the being of God; others struck at Marcellus's language about a temporary "expansion" of the divine essence, by which the "Son" —that is, as Marcellus was supposed to mean, the human person as taken into temporary relations with the "forth-going" Word—began to exist; others, earnestly enforcing the pre-existence and divinity of the Son as absolutely, and not in mere divine foreknowledge, living and divinely energising (*i.e.* in subordinate ministration), before His nativity in the manhood, must have been at once

understood as illustrating the condemnation of Photinus. The whole document is interesting, and may be taken as a specimen of the better kind of Arianizing formulas. Hilary, who had long before received baptism in the faith of a really eternal Christ, utterly separate in His essential being from all created existences, and was shortly afterwards elevated to the bishopric of Poitiers as the hope and strength of Gallic Christianity, makes the best (for an irenic purpose) of this long Sirmian Creed as virtually Catholic, as implying an essential unity between the Father and the Son, and—in spite of one or two phrases which by themselves might cause suspicion—consistent with a belief in the Co-equality; but in this connexion he himself uses language overstrongly Subordinationist. Athanasius ranks the formula as one of the Eusebian or Arianizing attempts to provide a substitute for the Creed of Nicæa. At any rate, the Council which produced it must in fairness be treated as more respectable than an ordinary Eusebian synod, in that, as Newman says, "it met to set right a real evil, and was not a mere pretence with Arian objects." But the "real evil," even yet, presented some difficulty: Photinus complained to Constantius that he had been unjustly condemned; nor was it until after a formal discussion, in presence of certain appointed judges, between Basil and the deposed prelate, that the latter was pronounced to have merited his sentence, and accordingly sent into exile, from which he did not return during the lifetime of the Emperor.

That prince might, in this case, be acting chiefly as the instrument of a well-deserved indignation against a thorough-going denial of the pre-existence of Christ. But he was himself prepossessed in favour of Semi-Arianism: he had been the oppressor of orthodox bishops; and now, as the master not only of the East but of Illyricum, and the rightful heir of the whole Constantinian inheritance, he was only too likely to show his real mind by renewing the persecution which his late brother's remonstrances or menaces had induced him, seven years before, to intermit. The orthodox of Constantinople must have soon begun to tremble for their bishop; and they had a speedy fulfilment of their worst apprehensions. Philip, the prætorian prefect of "the Orient," who, as such, presided not only over the "Orient" proper, but over three other "dioceses," and who enjoyed the full favour of Constantius for some time after he quitted office,—as late, at least, as September of 351,—was commissioned—probably about the end

of 350—to perform a very different service for the master whose success, coming when little expected, and amid circumstances peculiarly favourable to his Arian advisers, impelled him as by an overmastering instinct into the congenial path of Arianizing tyranny. Philip was to expel Paul once more, and once for all, and effectually. He "remembered," says Milman, "the fate of Hermogenes:" he sent a message to the bishop, respectfully desiring him to come to the Baths of Zeuxippus, where business of importance required his presence. Paul, we may suppose, set forth from his house near the cathedral of St. Sophia, which had been completed during the usurpation of his see, and had but to traverse the rectangular piazza or forum called Augustæum in order to reach the appointed meeting-place, which, in its all but fresh adornments of stately columns and statues of bronze, was situated between the palace-entrance and the eastern end of the Hippodrome. Philip showed him the imperial order: the prelate, whose spirit, perhaps, was broken rather by his frequent misfortunes than by age—for he was comparatively young some fifteen years earlier—submitted, and allowed himself to be huddled through a door leading into the imperial palace, and thence on board a boat and across the Bosporus. There was need for this precaution; for the people, suspecting mischief, were crowding round the baths in a mood which boded danger. But Philip was prompt as well as crafty: he had orders to install Macedonius in the bishopric, and he lost no time in presenting that often-baffled aspirant to the gaze of the astonished crowd, among whom, says Socrates, he appeared "as suddenly as a missile shot from an engine;" they saw him seated beside Philip in his state-carriage, escorted by guards with drawn swords to the gates of St. Sophia. The people were too utterly taken by surprise to contemplate any hostile demonstration; but they crowded blindly and confusedly into the cathedral precinct, and the soldiers, finding their way thus obstructed, chose to think that resistance was intended, and cut down those who thronged around them, until some 3150 corpses, slaughtered, or crushed in the desperate struggle to escape, covered the pavement across which the Arian bishop, after what Socrates ironically describes as "this brilliant success," passed in triumph to his throne beyond the altar. From that tragic day to the enthronement of Gregory Nazianzen in the winter of 380, the see of Constantinople was a stronghold of Arianism, and of Arianism in alliance with such irreverence and worldliness as to bequeath

sore trouble to the episcopate of that high-souled, fervid saint, whose name was destined to be one of the few glories of ecclesiastical "New Rome." There was something like an anticipation of St. Chrysostom's last afflictions in the brief remainder of the life of Paul. He was carried in chains to Cucusus, a lonely little town on the Cappadocian frontier, long afterwards selected as the place of Chrysostom's exile. There he died—but how? There were dark rumours: the people of Cucusus said that his death was not natural; one story rested on the authority of a bishop named Serapion, as having heard the Arian persecutor Philagrius say that Paul was left for eleven days without food in a narrow cell, and, being found alive at the end of that time, was strangled —presumably by the orders of Philip. Sozomen candidly acknowledges that he has never been able to ascertain whether disease or violence was the cause of Paul's death; but we cannot wonder that he was regarded as a martyr in the cause of Catholic Christianity, and that he holds his place among confessors in the Greek and Latin calendars alike. His death may be dated in the beginning of 351, and the likeliest account of his four expulsions is, that he was banished (1) to Pontus by Constantine, (2) to Singara and to Emesa by Constantius, (3) was ordered to repair to his old home in Thessalonica in consequence of the Hermogenes tumult, and (4) finally was carried off to Cucusus in 350. When Philip himself died, in disgrace and misery, a year after Paul's "martyrdom," the Catholics naturally said, "It is a judgment."

The news of this tragedy, no doubt, sounded to the Alexandrian Churchmen as ominous of some great trouble approaching their own doors. Athanasius, indeed, had given no umbrage to Constantius: the first public act of his, after the death of Constans had left the Eastern Emperor the sole possession of the imperial rights, was to bid prayer, so to speak, in his church, for "the good estate of Constantius Augustus," in the hearing of the "duke" or general Felicissimus, and six other high secular officials; and his people at once and unanimously responded, "O Christ, send help to Constantius!" But he had seen reason to take in hand the task of compiling the great "Apology," or Defence, against the Arians, by way of meeting the objection that the old charges against him had never been satisfactorily disproved; and did so first by producing evidence of the judgment of synods and bishops in his favour, and then by exhibiting the grounds on which those judgments were based. This explains the inartistic and unchronological

arrangement of the work. In 350 he was visited by certain envoys from Magnentius to Constantius, including Servatius, bishop of Tongres; and he burst into tears when speaking to him of Constans. But Valens and Ursacius were again at their work as intriguers. Liberius, who succeeded Julius of Rome on May 22, 352, was plied with letters against Athanasius, which however were outweighed, in the judgment of his Roman synod, by an encyclical from eighty suffragans of Alexandria; and this proves the spuriousness of a letter in the Hilarian "Fragments" in which Liberius is made to say that he had summoned Athanasius to appear at Rome and answer to certain charges, but that Athanasius had ignored the citation. But Constantius, on his westward journey against Magnentius in 351, had been irritated, says the "Arian History," by seeing that so many bishops retained communion with Athanasius. Therefore, "like one set on fire, he suddenly changed his mind;" and in the spring of 353 Athanasius heard enough of the Emperor's unfriendly mood to resolve on sending five bishops, one of them his friend Serapion of Thmuis, and three presbyters, as a deputation, in order, if possible, to conciliate Constantius. Four days later, on May 23, Montanus, a body-guard or "Silentiary," arrived, with an imperial letter of a startling kind. "The bishop of Alexandria was not to send any messengers to court; but as he had requested leave to visit the Emperor at Milan, he was free to do so." As he had requested? He had never made any such request. He saw through the attempt to decoy him, and answered that a permission granted on a misconception must, of course, be regarded as having no weight: if the Emperor sent him a distinct order to appear at Milan, he would set forth at once; until then, he should stay at Alexandria. The baffled agent of this ignoble device left Alexandria accordingly, as Sozomen says, "without having effected anything." It appears that one false charge made against the archbishop was the extravagantly absurd one, that he, the friend of Constans, had had treasonable dealings with Magnentius. A letter purporting to come from him to the usurper was exhibited by his Arian foes, among whose resources the forger's craft was not inconspicuous. Another charge was not so manifestly slanderous, and he had to take some pains to confute it: there might seem to be a *primâ facie* likelihood that he had stirred up Constans against Constantius for his own purposes; but in fact, as he afterwards proved, his intercourse with Constans had been so scanty as to give him no opportunity for such an

exercise of his influence, even supposing that he had had any wish to do so. He had written to Constans twice, and heard from him thrice, and had seen and spoken to him in several places, such as Milan, Aquileia, and Verona, but never alone.

Constantius was now more powerful and more formidable than ever; and a new Council was spoken of as to be called in the West under his auspices, for the settlement of all the ecclesiastical dissensions, after the successful close of the civil war. Liberius, in the name of many Italian bishops, desired the Emperor to convoke it at Aquileia. This request was conveyed through Vincent, now bishop of Capua, and Marcellus, another Campanian bishop, who also were entrusted with the documents for and against Athanasius, which had been laid before the Church of Rome. These deputies found Constantius at Arles, some thirty-nine years after the great Council held there on the Donatist case. He refused to let the proposed Council meet anywhere but in that city; and it assembled there in the winter of 353, under circumstances most threatening to the Catholic cause. The bishop of Arles, Saturninus, was a violent Arian; and the first step taken was the presentation, by Constantius's orders, of a draft of a sentence condemning Athanasius. On the other hand, the Roman delegates demanded that the theological question should take precedence of the personal: "Let us first settle the point of doctrine, and then go on to points of conduct." No, the Arians would hear of nothing of the kind. At last, the delegates so utterly forgot their duty under the pressure of this Arianizing dictation, backed up as it was by imperial support, that they gave up the cause of Athanasius, on the condition that Valens and his friends would in their turn give up the cause of heresy. "Better to yield the point," they thought, "as to one man than to lose the opportunity of a triumph for the faith." A foolish and culpable forgetfulness that there were cases, and this was one of them, in which one man impersonated the faith; and that in no case whatever could the faith be secured by acquiescence in a manifest injustice. Valens and the Arians, having secured their point, fell back on their possession of a majority in the Council, and refused to entertain the dogmatic question; all that insistence could do was done in order to force all the bishops present to sign the renunciation of Athanasius (who, as Dr. Pusey once observed, might easily be misrepresented to, or misunderstood by, the average Latin mind); and all gave way on the side of the orthodox minority, save

one whose firmness put to shame the weakness of the Roman deputies. That one man was Paulinus, the worthy successor of Maximin at Treves; he withstood all threats and all persuasions, and was banished first into a Phrygian district, where he had to dwell among adherents of Montanist fanaticism still surviving in its ancient birthplace, and then to some remoter spot beyond the limits of Christendom. Liberius, on hearing of this result of the Council, wrote to Hosius in bitter vexation and sorrow. "I hoped much from Vincent, who had often sat with your Holiness as a judge in that cause. I had believed that, with him as legate, the Gospel of God would be preserved in its entirety. He has not only gained nothing, but has himself been carried away into that dissimulation. After what he has done, I am affected with a twofold grief, and have resolved, for my part, to die in God's cause rather than give my adhesion to a judgment that is against the Gospel." To Cæcilian, bishop of Spoletum, Liberius wrote, "Dearest brother, let not Vincent's conduct turn you back from the purpose of acting rightly." There was need for energetic warning, and for co-operation among faithful-hearted Italian bishops; for trouble was "hard at hand."

"The situation," says Hefele, "was most critical, for the Emperor required the Italian bishops to break off all ecclesiastical relations with Athanasius." Then it was that Liberius found sympathy and help in the steadfastness of Eusebius, bishop of Vercellæ, who was famed as the first Western prelate that personally adopted monastic rules of life, and who, as combining spiritual fervour and zealous faith with patient sweetness and equitable intelligence, was eminently qualified to uphold the cause of Catholic truth at this specially trying crisis. Another auxiliary was fully as zealous as Eusebius, but far less equable in temperament, and, while wholly incapable of fear, or of any weakness that might compromise his religious loyalty, was too likely to spoil the good effects of his sturdy constancy by hot-headed and uncharitable vehemence. This was Lucifer, bishop of Caliaris, the metropolitan see of Sardinia. He came to Rome, and offered to go to the Emperor and demand another Council, which should proceed on better principles than that of Arles: Liberius accepted the proposal, and united with Lucifer a priest named Pancratius, and a deacon named Hilary, who afterwards became famous, but whose fame, like Lucifer's, was in the end such as no Catholic would envy. The Pope sent by these deputies, probably at the beginning of 354, a letter to Constantius,

in which he began by endeavouring to allay the Emperor's known irritation against himself, as expressed in a recent letter to the Romans, and then referred to false charges which had produced or increased it. He was accused of having suppressed certain letters of the Easterns, because they inculpated Athanasius. On the contrary, he had read them, in his church, to his Council. They had been considered, and had been only put aside when outweighed by letters from the Egyptian Church. Then, with somewhat too much, perhaps, of self-consciousness, Liberius protested that he had come to the see of Rome unwillingly, but that in it he hoped to remain without offending God for the rest of his life, observing the rules handed down by his predecessors, and holding fast that faith, in its inviolate purity, which had been transmitted by "such eminent bishops, most of whom were martyrs," —an exaggeration due to local tradition or legend. Then he came to the matter in hand. The Easterns professed to wish for peace. What peace? Could he forget that, eight years before (he was alluding to the events of the spring of 345, when the "Macrostich" was presented to the Westerns), four of these Eastern bishops refused to condemn Arianism in a Council at Milan; and was it not patent, from a letter of Alexander of Alexandria to "Silvester of holy memory"—apparently the first of Alexander's encyclicals—that before Athanasius became bishop, a number of priests and deacons were excommunicated for Arianism, some of whom, at the very time at which he was writing, were said to have organized councils for themselves, outside the pale of the Catholic Church? In these circumstances, how could the Easterns be regarded otherwise than with suspicion? He then described the unfairness with which his delegates at Arles had been tricked into a seeming compact, which proved to be no compact at all: such proceedings deprived the recent Council of all moral weight, and Liberius must now solemnly call upon the Emperor, by his sense of gratitude to God for the signal overthrow of his enemies and establishment of his authority, to let the whole matter come before another Council, in which the decisions of Nicæa, approved by his father, should be treated with deserved respect. Liberius had already written to Eusebius of Vercellæ, asking him to support the request by his influence with the Emperor; he now again wrote in commendation of the bearers of this letter, "I know that the Spirit of God is fervent in you. Act with my delegates, as may be pleasing to God and His angels, and beneficial to the Catholic Church." Eusebius heartily entered

into his feelings and hopes; and when the delegates came into North Italy, and visited him on their way into Gaul, he gave them a cordial welcome—the more cordial, probably, because Lucifer was his countryman and friend. On hearing of this kindness, Liberius wrote to him again a third time, acknowledging a letter which Eusebius had written on their arrival, and exhorting the bishop of Vercellæ, in terms which his own subsequent history invests with a painful interest, to go on "labouring as a good soldier of the Eternal Sovereign, and to show himself in the character of a priest speaking the truth." He also wrote to Fortunatian of Aquileia, in whom he expressed a confidence which events proved to be unfounded—one must needs say as unfounded as that confidence which Liberius apparently was now placing in himself.

Some months elapsed before Constantius gave his assent to the Pope's request. When he did so, it was probably because his Arian advisers themselves professed to wish for another Council, at which their work might be done more thoroughly than at Arles. Accordingly, in the beginning of 355, three hundred Western bishops, and a small number of Eastern ones, assembled at Milan. The place might seem less unfavourable than Arles to the interests of orthodoxy, for Dionysius, the bishop who, as such, was the leading prelate in the North-Italian provinces, was earnestly Catholic, and his people are spoken of by St. Hilary as "most pious"—a character which, in fact, they soon exhibited in days of trial. But the attitude assumed by Constantius himself was so menacing, and so ominous as to the policy which the Council might be made to carry out, that Eusebius declined to attend. On this, he was urged by a synodal letter, not without threats, to consult with its bearers, Eudoxius and Germinius, and then signify his acceptance of the condemnation of the heretics Marcellus and Photinus, and of the "sacrilegious" Athanasius. Constantius himself exhorted him to appear at Milan; the three Roman delegates, in a brief letter expressive of strong emotion, implored him to come and defeat Valens, as "Peter and Paul had overthrown Simon Magus." He wrote to the Emperor, saying that he now thought it their duty to come to Milan, where, as he significantly concluded, "I promise that I will do what shall seem just and well-pleasing to God."

The Council held its sittings, as usual, in the principal church. The metropolis of Northern Italy had several churches: two which are named by St. Ambrose were not in existence at the

time, for it was by Ambrose himself that they were dedicated—these were the "new" or "great" Basilica of the Apostles near the Roman gate, and the church represented by the present San Ambrogio. Ambrose mentions three others—the churches of SS. Felix and Nabor, and St. Fausta, and the "Portian church, outside the walls," westward of the Ambrosian. In one of these churches Dionysius presided as bishop, and here the Council met: for ten days Eusebius was excluded from their sittings, and when he was admitted, the plans of the Arian managers being matured, he was asked to sign the condemnation of Athanasius. It must always be remembered that this was not to profess any doctrinal opinion, but to recognise the previous condemnation of Athanasius on charges affecting his character. Like the Roman legates at Arles, Eusebius answered, "First let us settle the question of primary importance: I know that some bishops here present are not sound in the faith. Here"—and he produced a paper—"here is the Nicene Creed. If you will sign it, I will do what you please on other matters." It was a disingenuous speech, if strictly construed; but Eusebius well knew that the bishops would not sign the Creed with anything like unanimity. Dionysius, who seems to have made a similar promise, was naturally the first to take the paper; but Valens wrenched it, and the pen with which he was on the point of signing, from his hands, exclaiming, "We can get nothing done in *that* way." This scene took place within the chancel, which was separated by a curtain from the nave. The Milanese Church-people who crowded the nave could hear some disturbance, and became greatly excited: their bishop, it is said, went down into the nave to quiet them; he then returned into the sanctuary, but was called out again on the sudden arrest of a Catholic layman by military force. He is said to have told them not to defend the faith by arms. At another session Eusebius was again importuned to condemn Athanasius, and again insisted that, in the first instance, the Nicene faith should be affirmed. If Athanasius were afterwards proved guilty, he would condemn him. The people in the nave seconded Eusebius by outcries of "Turn out the Arians!" and Dionysius and Eusebius succeeded in signing the Nicene Creed in presence of the bishops, and immediately before the celebration of the Eucharist. It would appear that the celebration was demanded by the Catholic laity, and performed by Dionysius; that Lucifer was kept away from the church by Constantius, and that the people by their resolute attitude,

as they persisted in remaining for two nights in the church—a precedent followed in their later troubles—induced the Emperor to set him free. But the Arians, thereupon, transferred the Council to the palace, some idea of which may be derived from the stately columns remaining near the church of San Lorenzo. Dionysius, indeed, refused to leave "his people," but the other bishops attended, and Valens and Ursacius proposed the adoption of a letter bearing the Emperor's name, described by Lucifer, a most unfriendly witness, as written in a polished and graceful style. The imperial writer, who was essentially a pedant, and thought himself a philosophic theologian, had previously, it would seem, been inclined to the Semi-Arian theory, in its earlier and less technical form, as expressed in the Macrostich and the "long Sirmian Creed," which was drawn up, as we have seen, with his own cognisance. But now he seems to have drifted for the time into a bolder Arianism. His "letter," according to Lucifer, denied the reality of the Sonship, spoke of the Son as rather a titular than a true Son, as called God in an improper sense, and as, in fact, made out of nothing. It is not unlikely that this description may be in part a zealot's inference from the Emperor's words; but unless he has done them grave injustice, one must suppose that Constantius directly or indirectly denied in this formula the uncreatedness, eternity, and proper Godhead of our Lord. He now took up his station behind the curtain which, as usual, shut in his presence-chamber, so that he could hear what passed on the other side of it, and thus expressed his mind to the prelates by his officers. He argued in this fashion: "I am resolved to establish religious peace in my empire. This faith which I hold is attested by Heaven; for if I did not believe aright, God would never have thus signally blessed my reign: I should have been overthrown by my enemies, whereas I now hold undivided and undisputed sovereignty." It was that argument from temporal success of which his father had been so fond, and which, in his case, had been not a little supported by the approval of courtly bishops. But the Roman legates insisted that the Nicene faith, which this imperial document contradicted, was the immemorial, immutable faith of Christians; and Lucifer vehemently exclaimed, "If all the Emperor's army shot their darts at us, we would not change our mind in this matter. All the true servants of God are agreed on this—in the cause of salvation we trample the Emperor's authority underfoot! Let the Emperor see to his own soul's welfare; let

him, for his own sake, condemn Arianism." Constantius, it seems, persisted in saying that his document was orthodox; and they retorted, "To say so is to be a forerunner of Antichrist!" To Constantius, of course, such language was absolutely bewildering: he had never before been defied in his own palace; he seems to have resorted, in a confused manner, to alternate menaces and entreaties; and his advisers were reduced to the experiment of causing his "letter" to be read in church, in the hope that, at the worst, it might be heard without open resentment, as being composed by one who was only a catechumen. But it called forth a burst of indignation; and Constantius then passed to a point on which he might hope to be more successful, the personal charges against Athanasius—among which, probably, was included the enormity of having allowed a large church, built at Alexandria on ground belonging to the Emperor, and at his expense, and therefore known as "Cæsarean," to be used by the multitude of Alexandrian Church-people for Easter services before it had been finished and duly set apart by dedication. But the points chiefly insisted on would, of course, be those as to which, it might have been thought, the ingenuity of slander had done its worst and been put to shame. "Athanasius has committed grave offences," said the Emperor. Then came up once more the old fables of sacrilege and magic and assassination, guaranteed once again by the fluent audacity of Valens. "The bishops *must* condemn so great a criminal!" said Constantius. "How can we condemn a man unheard and unconvicted?" was the answer. "We are willing to go at our own expense into Egypt, to hear his case among his own people—only let the Emperor name Catholics as his accusers." No; the Emperor insisted on an immediate, an unqualified condemnation. He talked, said Lucifer afterwards, "as if we were gladiators, not bishops." They pointed indignantly to the confession made by Valens and Ursacius: "Will you rely on self-convicted calumniators?" "It is no question," replied Constantius, "of Valens and Ursacius: it is *I* who am now accusing Athanasius!" Then it was that the spirit of freedom and justice spoke out, by episcopal voices, in lofty defiance of a brutal Cæsarism: "You cannot accuse where you have no personal knowledge, and where the accused is not present. The matter, too, is not one which affects Rome, so that the Emperor's mere word could be taken as sufficient; in the present case, accuser and accused must stand on equal terms. Moreover, the present demand

has no canon to rest upon." Here, says the "Arian History," the despot broke in with a claim of undisguised absolutism: "Let my will serve for a canon, as it does with the Syrian bishops." The "History" is apt to use a good deal of dramatic freedom; but Constantius was likely enough, when incensed, to say something of the kind, and the bishops, then addressed, were as likely to "stretch out their hands," as if calling God to witness, and say, in terms or in effect, "Remember Who gave you the empire, and Who can take it away, and before Whom you must stand at the day of judgment! Do not introduce the imperial power into Church affairs, nor the Arian heresy into the Church." He laid his hand on his sword at hearing this, and for a moment thought of ordering them to execution; but they were condemned, as a matter of course, to exile. Such was the example thus set by Eusebius and Lucifer. Their fate was shared by Dionysius, who according to Lucifer had been beguiled into disowning Athanasius—but this is, perhaps, an exaggeration of a conditional promise; at any rate, he now cast in his lot with the two undaunted confessors, while another account describes him as incurring a like sentence by refusing to communicate with Arians. Pancratius and Hilary were nobly constant: Hilary was afterwards savagely beaten, but found comfort in thinking of the scourging of Christ. Maximus of Naples was also unyielding; so was another pious bishop, Rufinianus. But the great majority were terrorised into compliance with the Emperor's will, not only as to renunciation of Athanasius, but also as to profession of communion with the Arians: as Sozomen says, they acquiesced "either through fear, or through deceit, or in ignorance." Thus ended this unhappy Council of Milan, which Hilary calls a "synagogue of malignants," and Lucifer, with a sort of unconscious anticipation of a more famous scene at Ephesus, depicts more graphically as a "cave of robbers."

The association of Arianism with a persecuting temper is one of the prominent facts of this period: one cannot fairly say that it was inherent in the heresy, for if Western Arianism had its Hunneric, it had also its Theodoric; but in the case before us, an Arian autocrat's intolerance of opposition exhibits itself in a systematic oppression of the Church. Eusebius was banished to Scythopolis, the seat of the old Arian bishop Patrophilus; here he was repeatedly dragged about, and up and down stairs, as if to destroy him by sheer brutality. Lucifer was kept in a dark cell, under the guardianship of Eudoxius, bishop of Germanicia, who had

been one of the bearers of the Macrostich to Milan. Dionysius was banished into Armenia or Cappadocia, and his throne was filled by a Cappadocian named Auxentius, who had received ordination from Gregory, and whom Hilary afterwards denounced in a vigorous invective. Maximus died in the place of his exile; Rufinianus fell into the hands of a young prelate whom Constantius had drawn over into Arianism, Epictetus of Centumcellæ, who made his prisoner run before his carriage until, it is said, he died of internal rupture. Writing some years later, but certainly in a strain of such furious and, as it were, inarticulate indignation that one receives his statements with more than a little doubt, Lucifer speaks of the severities inflicted by Constantius on those bishops or ecclesiastics who would not disown Athanasius, as including not only banishment, imprisonment, condemnation to mines, but tortures and death in various forms; although, as in one passage he admits, Constantius wished torture to be inflicted, but not death. It was now that Martin, afterwards so famous, was "publicly scourged." It seems certain that several bishops were "removed from their sees by his mere authority, and that some," in Lucifer's words, were compelled to suppress their Catholic sentiments, "if they wished to sit quiet," so that "their love" for the faith was "chilled" by fear. City after city was visited by imperial messengers and palace-officers, threatening the bishops, setting the magistrates on to threaten them, announcing that all prelates must sign the anti-Athanasian documents presented to them, on peril of being hurried into exile. Clerics belonging to Valens and Ursacius attended the commissioners thus employed, in order, says the "History," to report to the Emperor any want of zeal on the part of the local magistracy: in any such case, there followed what Lucifer calls "formidable menaces" from Constantius, and some heavy fine was suspended *in terrorem* over the delinquent. The people in several cases loudly lamented as their bishops were dragged before the authorities; but they soon learned that such an expression of sympathy would be treated as seditious, and punished by "chains, insults, scourging, and confiscation." But Rome was now to be attacked; and Liberius was dealt with, in the first instance, by that policy of apparent gentleness which Constantius had employed in several cases with success: as Lucifer chose to put it, the "wolf came in sheep's clothing." Eusebius the high chamberlain, Constantius's all-powerful and villainous favourite, was sent with letters and gifts to win him over. He was asked to "sign against Athanasius"

—that is, to acquiesce in his condemnation—"and to communicate with the Arians." "This," said Eusebius, "is the Emperor's desire. Come, comply with his request" (the word "command" was not at first used), "and accept these presents from his bounty." "No," said Liberius,—according to the Athanasian narrative; it "would be an utter breach of all canons to condemn Athanasius, after he has been deliberately pronounced innocent. Let the Emperor, if he insists on having the case re-heard, summon a really free ecclesiastical assembly, where, in the first place, the Nicene faith may be secured, and then all questions as to conduct, on either side, may be impartially examined." Eusebius changed his tone, and took to threatening; then, leaving the Pope in the Lateran, he crossed the city to St. Peter's, and there presented the gifts as offerings. Liberius heard of this, and rebuked the sacristan of the church for not having prevented what he considered as a sacrilege: he then caused the gifts to be cast out of the basilica. This, of course, irritated Eusebius yet more: he returned to his master, and reported that there was no hope of gaining Liberius's adhesion—other methods must be taken; and, in consequence, a detachment of imperial agents came from Milan with orders to the prefect of Rome, that Liberius was to be inveigled away, or else forcibly secluded from his people. The latter and milder course was taken by the prefect: the very gates, the harbour, were guarded against Catholics who might wish to visit the bishop; families which supported him by their sympathy or reverence were threatened; bribes were used to detach his friends from his cause; plots were laid against ascetics and Christian ladies; bishops of neighbouring churches went into hiding; at length, in the middle of the night, Liberius was removed to Milan, and the Emperor, attended by Epictetus and Eusebius, endeavoured to shake his resolution. Theodoret gives a long conversation which, he says, is recorded to have then taken place (a statement which cannot be taken literally), and in which, if the text is right, he makes Eusebius affirm that Athanasius was proved to be heterodox in the Nicene Council! It is not improbable that, as Theodoret says, Liberius reminded the Emperor of the recantation of Valens and Ursacius—"a paper still in our possession;" that Epictetus accused Liberius of wishing to triumph over the Emperor's fixed purpose, and then to boast of it at Rome; that Constantius recurred to his favourite point, "Athanasius has intrigued against the security of my throne." The "History of the Arians," after its manner, puts

into Liberius's mouth a solemn admonition: "Cease to fight against Him who gave you the empire by persecuting those who are His servants, and who will never yield to an anti-Christian heresy." Constantius, according to Theodoret, offered him three days for consideration: he answered, "Three days, or three months, will not alter my mind." He was banished to Berœa in Thrace; and, while on his journey, refused supplies of money from Constantius and his wife, and also from Eusebius, to whom he returned the bitter message, "Go, and first become a Christian, before you presume to send me alms."

Hosius was, in some sense, a person whose adhesion was even more worth obtaining than that of the Roman bishop. His position in the Christian community was, as for many years it had been, unique. "He had passed a life, prolonged beyond the age of man"—for he was now more than a hundred years old—"in services and sufferings in the cause of Christ; he had been distinguished as a confessor in the Maximinian persecution;" he had sat in the Spanish Council of Illiberis in 305, and had presided at Nicæa and at Sardica; he was commonly known as "Father Hosius;" and his episcopate had extended over more than sixty years. About the same time at which Constantius made his attempt upon Liberius, Hosius was sent for, and requested to gratify the Emperor by disowning Athanasius and communicating with the Arians. He replied by a severe reproof, addressed to the Emperor in person—was allowed for the time to return home, but was importuned by letters from Constantius, which he regarded as "drops of rain or gusts of wind:" after several such letters had reached him, he wrote the memorable reply preserved by Athanasius, in which, after dwelling somewhat on his age, and his active participation in the proceedings at Sardica, he flatly denied the truth of the plea of coercion by which, it seems, Valens and Ursacius were wont to explain their now retracted apology. Then, in language full of earnest dignity, he exhorted the Emperor to "forbear intruding himself into ecclesiastical matters," and drew a strong line of distinction between the provinces of the civil and the spiritual power. "*We* have no right to exercise temporal rule, nor you to burn incense" (a metaphor taken from 2 Chron. xxvi. 18, and here used for the discharge of priestly functions). For the special point of Constantius's present urgency, he had one answer: "I will *not* join myself to the Arians,—on the contrary, I even anathematize their heresy: nor will I subscribe against

Athanasius, whom we and the Roman Church, and the Sardican Council, pronounced guiltless, and whom, in consequence, you yourself recalled with honour." He reminded the Emperor of his own letters and promises in favour of Athanasius; and bade him reflect that although in this world he might be gratifying his advisers, he would have to stand alone and answer for himself at the Day of Doom. This letter produced no effect on Constantius: he and his chamberlain renewed their attempts to frighten Hosius; and after learning that Hosius was writing to other bishops that they ought rather to die than to recognise Arianism, he sent for Hosius, and inflicted on him a protracted and painful detention at Sirmium, the tragic result of which will appear among the events of 357.

Before we leave, for a time, the affairs of the Western Church, so miserably compromised by the Councils of Arles and Milan, we must observe the position of the Catholics at Rome and in Gaul.

The substitution of Arianizing bishops for the banished Catholic prelates was part of that "thorough" Arian policy which Lucifer describes as Constantius's "attempt to destroy the Lord's vineyard." And he was not likely to shrink from carrying it out in regard to the great "apostolic" church which he had deprived of its as yet unyielding pastor. Epictetus was an instrument ready to his hand, when a new episcopal appointment was to be managed or enforced at Rome. And so, says the "Arian History," "having made preparations in the palace rather than in the church," and secured a packed meeting from which the Roman laity were excluded, and in which, therefore, their rights in the election were set aside, Constantius "compelled" three partisan bishops to consecrate, within the palace, "one Felix, a man worthy of them." Such a profanation as this would have been impossible in a Roman basilica; and Felix, in Athanasius's view, was manifestly an Arianizer, although, according to some statements, known to Socrates and Sozomen, he was either a reluctant tool in Arian hands, or was personally orthodox while he communicated with Arians: but anyhow the adherents of Liberius are said to have avoided entering any church where Felix was present. The strange (and yet, in one sense, not strange) attempts made by papal writers to save the credit of this "anti-pope," by representing him as appointed with the consent of Liberius, as acting for him during his exile, as condemning Constantius's heresy, and as winning the crown of martyrdom, are exposed and duly

characterized by Tillemont and by Döllinger. They have introduced a confusion into the papal enumeration by making it necessary to reckon Felix II. and III., in the fifth and sixth centuries, as Felix III. and IV. It must, however, be added that this Felix had supporters, both lay and clerical, who were strong enough to maintain party divisions which outlasted the life of Liberius himself, and had very deplorable results.

While the Roman Church was in this disabled condition, the Gallican, although much afflicted by such unworthy prelates as Saturninus of Arles, had recently gained a new champion of orthodoxy in Hilary of Poitiers. Elevated to that bishopric about 353, that is, some three years after his own conversion (of which he has given a most interesting account), Hilary might, says Tillemont, have secured a tranquil and prosperous position by sacrificing his convictions to his worldly convenience; he might have enjoyed the sunshine of court favour, and yet passed with many undiscerning persons for a Catholic bishop: "but the love for Christ, which lived in him by faith and hope, could tolerate no such disguise." He took his line decisively. In conjunction with many Gallic bishops, he publicly withdrew from all communion with Saturninus of Arles, Valens, and Ursacius; signifying at the same time that their less guilty associates might, on repentance, be again acknowledged as brethren, provided that the exiled prelates should approve of this resolution. And he wrote a short letter to the Emperor, which is called his "First Book to Constantius:" it is remarkable (especially when contrasted with his work "Against Constantius," written five years later, in 360) for the studied and respectful blandness of its tone towards the monarch, on whose kindly nature he professes reliance, while entreating him to restrain his judges from interfering in Church matters and oppressing Catholic ecclesiastics. It is still more remarkable for its emphatic protest in favour of religious freedom: the Emperor is too wise not to know that "no one ought to be coerced into an external conformity"—that peace and order can only be re-established by allowing every one to adopt, unrestrained, the religious profession which his own mind approves. This principle is placed by Hilary on the most sacred of all foundations: God Himself teaches men to know Him, but does not force their wills; or rather, He will not accept an involuntary homage; and therefore, even if coercion were used in the cause of the true faith, a bishop should protest, "I can only receive a willing proselyte."

He deprecates imputations of disloyalty or discontent, in order to make way for his entreaty that the Emperor would recall the banished bishops: he describes the Arian heresy as a "novelty," and the condemnation of Athanasius as a flagrantly unjust movement in defence of that novelty so righteously condemned. The tract concludes with a brief account of the proceedings at Arles. These protests of Hilary and his friends, four of whom took part in the memorial to Constantius, provoked the Arian party in Gaul to hold a Council at Biserræ, or Beziers, near Narbonne, in 356. As chief bishop of South Gaul, Saturninus would naturally preside. Hilary "denounced the patrons of the heresy, and offered witnesses to prove his assertions." But the bishops would not allow him a hearing: according to a statement afterwards made by Auxentius of Milan, they even deposed him from the episcopate; they accused him of sedition, first before the "Cæsar" Julian, who was then in command in Gaul, and afterwards before Constantius; and in consequence he and Rhodanius, bishop of Toulouse, a man whose gentle temperament was opportunely sustained by Hilary's immovable resolution, were banished into Phrygia. But, as he himself says, he took comfort in the assurance that "the word of God was not bound, but would have its free course." He began his great work "On the Trinity," perhaps originally entitled "On the Faith." In it he protests that he writes under a necessity laid upon him by the false theories of heretics; they have spoken amiss, and therefore Catholics must try to speak aright, while knowing that the subject transcends both thought and language. Yet in the course of his argument he sometimes forgets this *caveat*, and is tempted to follow up a line of speculation which may at any rate be called peculiar. Occasionally he seems to lose his way, and becomes not only obscure but inconsistent. On the one hand, he is afraid to face the humiliations involved in our Lord's assumption of humanity, and fairly startles us by his readiness to explain away texts that refer to them. On the other hand, he insists that to put on "the form of a servant" was incompatible with retaining "the form of God:" but this may be due to his mistake in confounding "form" or essential character with "fashion" or outward appearance; and Mr. Watson, in his very elaborate and thoughtful "Introduction to St. Hilary," considers that on the whole a laying aside of the form of God meant for him the concealment, during Jesus Christ's earthly life, of the divine "glory" or majesty.

Certainly nothing can be more explicit than Hilary's assertion that the Christ of the Gospels was at once true God and true Man; that in taking the human nature He did not, for He could not, give up the divine. Some of the difficulties in Hilary's Christology may be due to the cumbrous and tortuous style which defaces many passages, and of which Jerome says, truly enough, that it repels the "simpler" readers. To return to our story. The church of Toulouse suffered grievously after the removal of its bishop; some of its clergy were beaten with sticks, or with pieces of lead attached to thongs, and used for the punishment of criminals; and Hilary, in his description, adds the significant words, "And on Himself, as holy persons will understand with me, on Christ Himself hands were laid," by such insults offered to the consecrated elements as denied the validity of Catholic ministrations.

And now let us turn to the gathering of the storm round the head of the man whose position had not been as yet openly assailed since his return in 346, but whom Constantius so passionately desired to isolate and deprive of ecclesiastical sympathy. How long, the Alexandrians might well ask—how long would Athanasius be allowed to occupy his throne? The answer would be, Until the principal churches have been induced to disown him, and thereby to isolate him.

There had been symptoms of coming trouble, as we have seen, even in 353, when Montanus appeared with his mysterious despatch. For more than two years from that visit, the Alexandrian Church was left quiet, except that an order was sent to the prefect of Egypt that the usual allowance of corn should be no longer given to the orthodox clergy, but to the Arians, and that, in contradiction to the Emperor's declaration in 346, the adversaries of Athanasius should be free to criticize him and his adherents; and the magistrates were admonished, with menaces, to recognise the Arians as Churchmen. In the August of 355—exactly thirty years after the Nicene Council, and while, in mournful contrast to that hopeful time, the empire was traversed in all directions by Arian persecutors with the Emperor's authority at their back—an attempt was made once more, by an imperial "notary" or messenger named Diogenes, to lure Athanasius from Alexandria. This attempt was carried on for some four months, until December 22; then appeared a "duke" or general officer named Syrianus, whose presence awakened so much anxiety that

memorials were addressed to him by the clergy and by the majority of the citizens, in presence of the prefect of Egypt and the provost of Alexandria. Syrianus at last promised "by the life of the Emperor" that no change should be made in Church matters without fresh orders from the court. This interview took place on January 18, 356, and for more than three weeks all was quiet.

But on Thursday night, February 8 (the date has been established by Professor Gwatkin), Athanasius was at a solemn vigil that was being kept by Church-people of all classes, in preparation for a service on the Friday, in that church of St. Theonas from which, sixteen years before, he had withdrawn amid the preparations for the intrusion of Gregory. Suddenly, soon after midnight, Syrianus, with Hilarius a "notary," and Gregorius a chief of the police, beset the church at the head of a body of soldiers, more than five thousand strong. Feeling, as he expressed it, that he was bound to imperil himself for his flock, the archbishop "sat down on his throne" at the extreme end of the sanctuary, and ordered the deacon in attendance to "read a Psalm," which in our reckoning is the 136th, "and the people to respond, 'For His mercy endureth for ever,' and then all to depart,"—it being clear to him that not they, but he himself, would be the special mark of the assailants. The "reading," according to what we know from St. Augustine to have been the custom established by Athanasius, would be recitation rather than chanting; and as a subsequent protest, dated on February 12, puts it, "while the reading was going on," the doors were burst open: with a fierce shout, the soldiers rushed in; clashing their arms, discharging their arrows, which in some instances proved fatal, and brandishing their swords in the light of the church-lamps, they crowded up the nave, trampling down some of the people, who struggled to find their way out as others had already done. Voices of terror and wild excitement, mingling with the sacrilegious din of the irruption, penetrated into the sanctuary, urging the archbishop to save his life, to fly while yet he had time. "I will not stir," he answered, "until you have all got away safely." He stood up, and made his voice heard in the calm familiar summons, "Let us pray to the Lord;" then, after a very brief prayer, ordered all to escape as best they could. When nearly all had departed, the monks and clerics present literally dragged him from the throne, just as the soldiers were rushing through the chancel-gates; it would even appear from one

passage in the protest that hostile hands did lay hold on him for a moment, and that after the severe tension of those terrible minutes he looked like one in a dead faint as he was carried away; but he himself says that he thanked God, at that moment, that he had not endangered his people by preferring his own safety to theirs.

This was the memorable "flight of Athanasius," which forms a cardinal epoch in his life, and was followed by six years rather of concealment than of exile—concealment secured at first in the country near to Alexandria, from which he originally intended to go at once to Constantius, in the hope, or on the chance, that this last outrage might prove to have exceeded the Emperor's intentions, and that therefore the boldest course might in fact be the course of safety. Accordingly he began to compose an elaborate defence of his conduct, to be recited in the imperial presence, *if* he should be allowed an interview. The paper, which is artistically drawn up, must be read throughout on that hypothesis; and if, even so, it seems to us "unreal," we must allow for the long-standing traditions which governed all addresses to the "Augustus." Assuming the gracious disposition of the Emperor, he undertakes to answer the four recent charges against him—that of (1) prejudicing Constans against Constantius, (2) corresponding with Magnentius, (3) using the "Cæsarean" church before it had been dedicated, (4) disobeying the Emperor's summons to Italy. But while he was thus at work, the news of further persecution in the West, especially of the banishment of Liberius and the detention of Hosius—events, obviously, which had happened several months after the Council of Milan—made him hesitate about trusting himself within the reach of the Emperor; and he heard soon afterwards that the Arianizers were preparing to circulate among his suffragans a vague creed, couched in Scriptural language, but in fact ignoring the doctrine of Nicæa. To meet this danger to their steadfastness, Athanasius wrote a "Letter to the Egyptian and Lybian Bishops:" a task not rendered more easy by the agitating intelligence that another Gregory, so to speak, was to be intruded into his seat, in the person of George, a violent Arian from Cappadocia. This man was not without some literary tastes; "he had collected a valuable library;" he may have been, in former days, as Athanasius asserts, guilty of fraud, when acting as a contractor of stores at Constantinople; but such a story would be easily credited against a heretical usurper of the "Evangelical

throne." Of his ruthless temper there can be no doubt: when he arrived, as Gregory had done, in Lent—the Lent of 356, we may safely infer from Athanasius, for the government would not defer his intrusion for a year—Arian violences had, as in Gregory's case, preceded him; for the Count Heraclius, sent by Constantius expressly to announce his approval of Syrianus's proceedings, had encouraged a mob of the younger pagan working-men to attack with stones and clubs the worshippers at a Wednesday service or "Station" in the great "Cæsarean" church. The Easter of 356, in the first week of April, brought special trouble to bishops and ecclesiastics, virgins, widows, the poor of Athanasius's flock, and even private Catholic householders. We find Sebastian, a Manichean holding high military command, employed in the interests of George to break up a congregation which, on a June evening, the Sunday after Pentecost, was worshipping in a cemetery, the churches being now in the hands of the Arians. As it was, he came too late, for the service was over; but he seized some virgins and others, and, on their refusal to embrace the Arian communion, caused them to be beaten so brutally that some died from the blows, and their corpses were kept without burial. Then came the banishment of sixteen orthodox bishops, the flight of more than thirty, the installation of old Arians in the bishoprics thus vacated, or of "men notorious for their wealth," or of profligate young men who had not even gone through the catechumenate. Monasteries were destroyed, houses plundered, alms-women beaten on the soles of their feet, presbyters expelled from their churches and exposed to varieties of barbarous treatment; in short, a reign of terror was virtually proclaimed. Under such a trial of constancy, one can hardly wonder that some were induced to dissemble their belief, among whom were probably the two priests Achetas and Didymus, who, according to Lucifer, disowned their archbishop's faith, and professed Arianism; it is said also that Theodotus, bishop of Oxyrinchos, accepted re-ordination from George, and was in consequence disowned by his own flock, who were conspicuous for Catholic zeal.

Even after being informed of these tragic incidents, Athanasius appears not to have wholly abandoned his plan of personally confronting Constantius, and trying to recall him to better feelings, until he learned that one imperial letter had denounced him as a fugitive criminal who richly merited death, and that another had exhorted the two princes ruling in Ethiopia, Aizan

and Sazan, to send Frumentius, bishop of Axum, to Alexandria, that he might be instructed by George and other prelates in the knowledge of "the Supreme God," *i.e.* as we must interpret it, in the belief of the sole Divinity of the Father. Nothing came, however, of this attempt to disturb Frumentius; and we cannot give credit to the statement of Philostorgius, that Theophilus the Indian, an Arian missionary bishop, after visiting his native island of Diu and parts of Hindostan, arrived among the Axumites, and there "arranged the affairs" of religion, that is, established (or confirmed) the Arian faith. It is very likely that Theophilus had visited Axum, but incredible that he should have been the first preacher of Christianity in that district, and very improbable that he should have made any such impression as to supplant the Catholicism represented by Frumentius. But the tidings that Frumentius was to be sent, if possible, to Alexandria, and that he himself was to be sought for as far as the Ethiopian frontier, in order to be lodged in "the prison of the prefects," finally convinced Athanasius that he must, for his church's sake, give up his daydream of an "appeal unto Cæsar," and accept the condition of an exile. General Church history is not greatly concerned with the circumstances of his veiled and mysterious life during the next six years: enough to say that it was chiefly spent amid the cells of the Egyptian monks—partly, no doubt, on the hill of Nitria, or in the wilderness, so-called, "of the Cells," or in the yet remoter Scetis; partly, also, in the "monasteries and hermitages of the Thebaid," including an ancient tomb at Thebes. Antony had been taken to his rest a few weeks before the irruption of Syrianus and the flight of Athanasius; the latter doubtless had, before quitting Alexandria, received back, as Antony's legacy, a sheepskin cloak which had been his own gift, and which had been worn out in the service of his venerated "father." Pachomius, also, had died eight years previously, and his abbacy had passed through the hands of Petronius and Orsisius into those of Theodore, commonly called "the Sanctified," whom Pachomius had trusted with high duties at an early age, and who was said to have predicted the great increase of Arian persecution. Amon, the founder of the solitaries of Nitria, had died, perhaps, earlier than Pachomius; but at Nitria Athanasius might converse with Pior, Antony's disciple, who, according to a strange characteristic story, contrived, while visiting his old home at his superior's bidding, to keep his absurdly superstitious vow of never looking at the face of a relative:

there too, perhaps, he would find Pambon, celebrated alike for his humility, his tender charity, and his earnest vigilance against sins of the tongue; at Scetis he might admire the austerity and holiness of the priest Macarius "of Egypt," whose recorded sayings exhibit so much knowledge of the heart, and so much kindliness of nature. In the Thebaid, Macarius "the Alexandrian," whom Athanasius might have seen of old as a vendor of sweetmeats in the great city where every one was busy at some occupation, had already become famous among monks. He who had all his life reverenced the very name of Antony, and had been hailed at his election as a "proficient in self-discipline," would be at home in any monastic settlement, would readily content himself with the rough fare of the recluses, would put on the "colobium" or the "melotes" as readily as an episcopal habit, would sit at work on tracts or letters in a cell whose chief furniture was a mat of palm-leaves, would join as fervently as any monk in the daily psalmody, would naturally accept on a Sunday or a Saturday the office of celebrating the monastic Eucharist. We can thus picture him as listening to what Mrs. Oliphant, in her "Makers of Modern Rome," describes as "the evensong that rose as from every crevice of the earth, while the Egyptian afterglow burned in one great circle of colour round the vast globe of sky." And all the time, the "royal-hearted" fugitive would be the true though "invisible patriarch," most effectively and systematically governing his church by a network of correspondence, which would be kept up by means of that rapid and secret intercourse which linked the Egyptian monasteries to each other. And that facility of communication would often doubtless secure the archbishop against those who were sent in pursuit of him: as a deacon of his in earlier days had found Arsenius gone when he had all but "run him down" in Upper Egypt, so, on the nearer approach of danger, Athanasius would be swiftly removed to another hiding-place—perhaps only just in time, and with such "hair-breadth 'scapes" as might anticipate the experience of a fugitive Jacobite or Vendéan. And yet it is to this period of exciting and perilous adventure that we owe some of his most important works: for in him the balance and equipoise of high qualities involved a signal power of concentrating all his faculties on the duty of the day or the hour; his strength had in it a serene presence of mind. The great theological "Discourses against the Arians" were composed during this "exile;" so were the theological letters to Serapion on that

newly arisen variation of Arianism which described the Holy Spirit as the highest of ministrant beings, the theory commonly known as Macedonianism; so, too, the short letter to the same Serapion, giving an account of the death of Arius. Historically the most interesting of the writings now under consideration is the "Defence concerning the Flight." It was called forth (probably late in 357) by Arian sarcasms about his "cowardice," set on foot by Leontius of Antioch and other members of the party. He is thus led to narrate the circumstances which had rendered such "flight" inevitable, and, on New Testament grounds, justifiable; and in the concluding part he shows that he has at last utterly given up all hope of justice from Constantius, although we may reasonably follow Professor Gwatkin in doubting the genuineness of a single and abrupt reference to Constantius as "the heretic." A "Letter to the Monks" introduces the Arian History, in which we can hardly help discerning in various passages a hand that is not his own, betrayed by inconsistencies, inaccuracies, and overdone declamation; and a recent French biographer of "St. Athanase," while accepting it as his work in the proper sense, treats it as one of the party pamphlets, intended for secret circulation, which were frequent in the literature of the age, and to which he finds a parallel in a little work which Aetius, as quoted by Epiphanius, describes as "privately composed" by him, and published in a corrupt form by his opponents. We may now look away from the actual persecution to the disintegration of the Arian body itself.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE VARIATIONS OF ARIANISM.

SELDOM, perhaps, have the faith and patience of Catholic Christians been more severely tried than in the two years that followed after the Council of Milan, and the successful terrorising of so many Western bishops. It might seem that the work of Nicæa was practically undone, and that a relentless autocrat, as yet, like his father, extraneous to Christian communion, was to be the instrument of heresy for securing its position within the Church. And yet, just about this time, the radical incoherences of that rationalistic Christology which Lucifer so often designates as Arian "idolatry," and Athanasius as Arian "fanaticism," but which may be best regarded as in effect a method of adapting Christianity to certain un-Christian forms of thought, and evacuating its cardinal doctrines of their real life and power, began to show themselves more and more distinctly, and to prepare the dissolution of what had once seemed an organized mass.

The original Arianism, as it confronted Alexander of Alexandria, was an outspoken assertion of what appeared to Arius, Achillas, Euzoius, and their companions, to follow inevitably from the Sonship of our Lord. It consisted chiefly of a series of negations, with which we are already familiar, and which were based, more or less directly, on the original negation of the Son's existence from all eternity. At the same time, there was in this original Arianism a recognition of His dignity as superior to that of all other creatures, and of His office as the agent of God in creating them. And so, when it became necessary for Arius, after his departure from Alexandria, to present his opinions in some form which would not startle or shock the ordinary Christian mind so seriously as their first utterance had startled and shocked the faithful of Alexandria, he had but to emphasize one part of his teaching, and disguise the

true bearing of its more characteristic elements. He could lay stress on what distinguished the Son, as he conceived him, from the generality of creatures: could proclaim him morally immutable; could even give him the title of "full God," in the sense, of course, of a titular divinity. And this modification, or "embellishment," as it has been called, of the original Arian "impiety," was carried yet farther by Arius's powerful supporter, Eusebius of Nicomedia, and others like him, than by Arius himself, who, to do him justice, reaffirmed, in his letter to his own bishop, his belief that the Son was a creature. The Eusebians, not liking openly to attack the Nicene doctrine, adopted an evasive line of speaking on the person and being of the Son: they addressed themselves to the work of undermining the Homoousian faith by suggesting formulas which ignored the Homoousion, but which *seemed* to recognise the Son's divine dignity, hailed Him, in the words of the "Lucianic" or proper Antiochene creed, as "the Father's adequate image," and at the same time satisfied the numerous minds that suspected Sabellianism in Homoousian language, and feared that to represent the Son as within the incommunicable essence was, in effect, to deny His true personality.

Such was the earlier kind of Semi-Arianism, represented in part by the creeds of Antioch, the creed presented to Constans, and afterwards adopted at Philippopolis, not to say by the "long exposition" or "Macrostich" of 344. But out of this theology, so to call it, of expedients, grew up, by degrees, a *bonâ fide* belief in the theological position thus provided. The facts bear out Newman's view, that many pious and learned divines, such as Basil of Ancyra, were really anxious to go all lengths in extolling the Son of God, short of the Homoousion, and only shrank from that because they fancied that it savoured of Sabellianism, or of materialistic conceptions of Godhead; as to which Hilary observes that these false senses of the term would be excluded if care were but taken to affirm the Divine Sonship, and St. Basil urges that it was even anti-Sabellian, "for nothing is 'homoousion' with itself." But the elder Basil and his friends were really anxious to think and speak reverentially of their Saviour. They would not admit that He was a creature, as the old Arians had said; they owned the Filiation to be "apart from time," and to have a relation to the Father's "essence:" so that they got near to the recognition of the Son as co-eternal and co-essential, but did not come up to

it. They were, so to say, befogged by the subtlety of their own distinctions, and did not see that they ought to have either affirmed more or denied more. It appears that their formula, "Homoiousion," —He is not one in essence with the Father, but He is "like in essence" to the Father,—was suggested, in the first instance, by what passed at Alexandria when the first Arians were condemned. Those men had denied, among other things, that the Son was "like in essence" to the Father. The men of the later school of whom we are now thinking had not, according to Socrates, employed as their own this formula rejected by the original Arians until the year 360, when Macedonius, who had been Semi-Arian bishop of Constantinople, suggested it as a convenient party watchword. Yet even if we could accept this statement, their minds were "Homoiousian" before they promulgated the phrase. Of that phrase three things may be said: first, that it was its authors who exhibited that readiness to "divide the world upon an iota" which has often been imputed to the Catholics, whose phrase was in the field before theirs attempted to dislodge it; secondly, that, as Gibbon candidly remarks, a close approximation in terms may cover a wide opposition of ideas; and thirdly, that it showed the inconsecutiveness of their thought, for how could one who was not fully God be "like to the essence" which is unique because supreme? The Semi-Arians sometimes took advantage of the phrase, "In all points like to the Father;" a phrase which Cyril of Jerusalem, who was long ranked among them, employed in his "Catechetical lectures," and which Basil, in May, 359, expanded, so to say, into "Like in *hypostasis*, and being, and existence." But, in truth, Socrates's statement (ignored by Sozomen) places the adoption of the Homoiousion, as a substitute for the Homoousion, at least three years too late—for it was evidently current, as we shall see, before the middle of 357. And it was asserted by them with a genuine desire to bar out the grosser and more offensive forms of Arianism, and with a religious earnestness which, as Newman expresses it, makes "the men better than their creed," and goes far to explain the tenderness and considerateness with which two such haters of Arianism as Athanasius and Hilary speak of them as virtually differing rather in terms than in real belief from the upholders of Nicene orthodoxy. The respect thus paid to the best representatives of this kind of Semi-Arianism may be most conveniently represented in the title of "Saint" allowed to Cyril, who was, at any rate for a considerable

time, "afraid of the Homoousion," yet in teaching allowed all that it meant, a veritable, personal, and eternal Divine Sonship. The hope entertained by Catholics as to the Semi-Arians as a body was that, by finding their position to be unreal, they might come to unlearn their prejudices against the Homoousion; a hope in some instances verified at a later time, in others doomed to disappointment.

But there was another development of the Eusebian or older Semi-Arian school which tended in the opposite direction, towards an Arianism more thorough-going and intense. This was its chief representative, the "Homœan" theory, called "Acacian" from Acacius, bishop of Cæsarea. But its basis was of older suggestion. Early in the controversy, at the Nicene Council itself, it appears that a jealousy was expressed as to the use on the Catholic side of any terms "not found in Scripture." The Nicene fathers endeavoured to meet this feeling by adopting Scriptural phrases, but found that every one of them was quibbled away on the Eusebian side, and that it was necessary, in the interests of Scriptural truth itself, to employ such terms as "essence" and "co-essential." After the Council, Eusebius of Cæsarea, in his letter to his flock, implied some sympathy on his part with this dislike of "non-Scriptural" language; at least, one reason which he there gave for having been ready to reject some Arian phrases was that they were "not in Scripture." And this point, "The Homoousion is not a Scriptural term," was urged by Constantia's Arian chaplain on Constantius, and no doubt many times in other cases. "Why," it might be asked, "should not all Christians be content to express their belief in the words sanctioned by the Holy Spirit? Have we not seen trouble enough arise from technicalities of man's framing? Is not the safe, the charitable, the truth-seeking course simply this, to call the Son 'like to the Father according to the Scriptures,' and if you will, 'in all points like,' without employing such words as Ousia or Homoousion"? There was a manifest plausibility in this suggestion: it appealed to some minds that were weary of debate, to others that suspected some mischief in the Homoousion, or in any other form of a philosophic term that had been taken in different senses; to others, again, who had a real honest reverence for Scripture, and might be apt to forget that a dispute as to the true meaning of Scripture words could only be met by a "non-Scriptural" expression of that meaning, and that no question was ever solved, but could

only be shelved, by "colourless indefiniteness." And it was the learned and ready-witted successor of Eusebius of Cæsarea, a man very capable of shifting his ground, but whose real affinities were with true Arians, that gave prominence to the thought, and emphasis to the watchword—about 350, as Newman considers, when he had become involved in his quarrel with the "Semi-Arian" Cyril. Thus the symbol of the "Homoion" gradually came forward into view: it was intended by its authors to resist those Semi-Arian tendencies which seemed favourable, in the long run, to the Catholic dogma; and, as we shall find, its result was a stimulus and effective support given to the most pronounced form of Arianism; for although the formula of which we must now say something, and which appears as the Ultra-Arian watchword, was verbally in direct contradiction to the confession of "likeness," its maintainers could admit a "likeness" which was only moral, and therefore predicable of any created being whose will was at one with the will of God.

Ultra-Arianism, in fact, was a revival, without disguise, of the old Arianism that shrank not from calling the Son of God "a creature and a handywork." Its formula was, "The Son is unlike the Father:" it called Him "Anomoion," and hence its maintainers were known as Anomœans. Their leader was Aetius, a man whose earlier life was a series of strange adventures, in which he displayed a versatility and ingenuity that might forecast his subsequent ascendency over many minds less energetic and self-reliant. He might have been surnamed "the Irrepressible." A friendless orphan lad at Antioch, he began life in the employment of a vinedresser, and had then gone into the trade of a goldsmith, or, as the Catholics chose to say, of a blacksmith or tinker: he next appeared as a physician's assistant; and in the medical society of Antioch his natural aptitude for disputation became sharpened and intensified, until he found his way into employment as a "sophist" or professional arguer; and this, with the bias towards Arianism which an Arianized medical school had communicated, is said to have recommended him to Paulinus, the Arianizing bishop of Antioch. Then it was, according to Philostorgius, his admiring historian, that he made good his position as irresistible in logical fence, or what was then called "eristic," and vented such strong Arianism that Eulalius, the next bishop, obliged him to leave the city. He retired to Anazarbus in Cilicia, where, after he had for a time been servant and pupil to a "grammarian," or

lecturer upon ancient standard texts, Athanasius the bishop, who had, as his great namesake informs us, spoken of our Lord as "one of the hundred sheep," gave him some countenance, and some instruction in the Gospels. From Anazarbus he passed on to Tarsus, and read the Epistles with a friend named Antony; then, venturing to revisit Antioch, was welcomed by Leontius, at that time a presbyter, who introduced him to the study of the Prophets. He again returned to Cilicia, and there was sorely vexed by being beaten in an argument with one of the Borborians, an infamous Gnostic sect; but he found a salve for this mortification at Alexandria, where he utterly confounded a leading Manichean. He then resumed his old medical studies, combining them with further pursuit of Aristotelian logic; and, "thus accomplished," he once more returned home, where Leontius, now bishop of Antioch, ordained him deacon—Hefele says, about 350. As his opinions must have been well known, at least in their main features, this was one of the boldest steps on which that cautious prelate ever ventured; and Flavian and Diodore remonstrated so indignantly, that he was obliged to forbid Aetius to officiate. These remonstrances were probably grounded on his offensive rationalism—on what Theodoret calls his alteration of theology into "technology," or his sophistical use of ambiguities connected with such a term as "Ingenerate," or his insistence on the mutual exclusiveness of the phrases "from whom" and "through whom," which Basil mentions in his work "On the Holy Spirit." In any case, Aetius was requested by his friends to revisit Alexandria, and oppose Athanasius on his own ground; and he kept no terms with the more moderate Arians, but insisted on the non-eternity and createdness of the Son as involving a difference from the Father in essence, which could be summarised in the word "Anomoion"—understood, of course, in regard to nature, not to will. He gained a powerful assistant in Eunomius, a Cappadocian who was recommended to him as a secretary, who was destined to succeed and surpass him in the theoretical formulation of Ultra-Arianism, and who also resembled him in the early struggles by which he rose from the condition of a labourer's son to that of a "pædagogus" (a servant whose duty was to conduct a boy to and from school), and, on being dismissed by his employer, took to tailoring until he became acquainted with Aetius. Such, at least, is the account given by Gregory of Nyssa, who also accuses him of laxity in moral teaching; but this is probably due to hostile

report. Anyhow, Eunomius, like Aetius, was an eager student of Greek dialectic, totally devoid of reverence, with very little knowledge, says Socrates, of the letter of Scripture, and none at all of its true purport. But he was, we must suppose, a man of real ability, for Basil the Great and his brother Gregory did not disdain to write against him, and the Anomœan Philostorgius calls him far superior to Aetius in "erecting a superstructure on a basis,"—in other words, in working out a definite and positive system, of which one characteristic point was the utter negation of all mystery in the things of God. Arius himself had represented the Father's essence as beyond the cognisance of the Son; and this, of course, was with him a mode of emphasizing the difference—the essential and really infinite difference—which, in his view, divided the Son from the Father. It was equivalent to saying, "The Son is a creature." But Eunomius went to lengths unheard of by the original Arians. He did, indeed, place as wide a gap as Arius had done between "the Ingenerate" and "the Generate;" but he threw aside the instinctive Christian belief in the ineffable, inscrutable vastness of the Divine nature, and declared that "man could, and did, know as much of God as God knew of Himself;" as Epiphanius tells us that the Anomœans affirmed that "man was as well acquainted with God's nature as he was with his own;" and Basil had to meet the Eunomian taunt that Catholics believed in an "unknown God," and to distinguish the senses in which God could be said to be known. Thus, in Eunomius, the rationalism which lay at the root of Arianism attained its full development: the heresy which began by assuming that it could argue with absolute confidence from human sonship to Divine, ended by proclaiming that God's essence was far from unsearchable, and His ways, accordingly, by no means past finding out. Gwatkin's estimate of this school is excellent: "presumptuous and shallow, quarrelsome and heathenising, yet not without a directness and a firmness of conviction, which gives it a certain dignity in spite of all its wrangling and irreverence."

This is, in a general outline, the history of the various forms of Arianism down to the period which we have now reached. The ground is disputed, at this crisis, not only between all Arians and all Catholics, but between different Arianizing parties: properly speaking, indeed, between two—the Semi-Arians with their symbol of Homoiousion, and the Anomœans who, in the person of Aetius, have already come into collision with such men as Basil of Ancyra;

the Acacian Arians being, in fact, in practical sympathy with the Anomœan line of thought, but ready to condemn it for the interests of their party, and disposed to advance as far as might be safe, but no farther, on the road which led to the extremities of Arian negation. The Semi-Arians, as we may express it, had to watch a foe on the right hand and on the left—one of these foes being apt to play virtually the game of the other. Basil of Ancyra might think the Homoousion inadmissible, but the vagueness of the Homoion would provoke and disquiet him: what if it should ultimately prove little better than the plain-spoken Anomoion? Might not the less repulsive of these two formulas be a decorous preparation for the other? Might it not turn out that (as Epiphanius afterwards said) those who said "Like" meant "only in will," and were at one with those who said "Unlike," meaning "in essence"? Amid such anxieties, it was not quite easy to depend on the Emperor Constantius. On the whole, he sympathized with the Semi-Arians; but occasionally, as at Milan, he "allowed himself to be swayed by Valens and Ursacius into a more definitely Arian position;" and the extraordinary violences of the Semi-Arian Macedonius at Constantinople, including the sacrilege of forcing the Eucharist into mouths held open by pieces of wood, could not fail to irritate the Emperor, who also resented his removal of Constantine's body from the insecurely built "Apostles' church" to another near the Propontis, with the result of a bloody tumult. At this questionable crisis, and probably soon after the midsummer of 357, the Arian leaders in the West contrived to hold another Council, which bears a most unhappy reputation, and which was eminently calculated to alarm the Semi-Arian party. It is, in fact, the third of the Sirmian councils; the first being held most likely in 348, soon after the Council of Milan in 347; the second, or "first *great* synod of Sirmium," in 351. The present Council was composed of Western bishops. Valens, Ursacius, and Germinius, the successor of Photinus, were its ruling spirits; and it sanctioned a creed, apparently composed by Potamius, bishop of Lisbon, but doubtless with the aid of Valens and Ursacius, and commonly known as the "Blasphemia,"—a name given to it by Hilary, who exhibits it in the original Latin, and repeatedly denounces it as "pestilent" and "most impious." This document, while owning the Son to be "God from God," and "our Lord and God," and confessing the Trinity as revealed in the form of baptism, distinctly proscribes the use of Ousia, or Homoousion, or

Homoiousion, because they are not "Scriptural" terms, and because the matter is above human apprehension; and proceeds to affirm, absolutely, the superiority of the Father to the Son "in dignity and majesty," and the subjection of the Son to the Father "in common with all the things which the Father has made subject to Himself." Thus we see how a formula which, in some sense, was Acacian, and which did not affirm the Anomoion, could be in real affinity to Ultra-Arianism. It is one of the most misleading points in Socrates's narrative that he places this creed in juxtaposition with that of 351.

But the tragical interest of this new Creed of Sirmium lies in the fact that it was signed—reluctantly, no doubt, and after protracted and spirit-breaking inflictions—by the venerable prisoner at Sirmium, "Father Hosius." Nothing in the long series of the meannesses and cruelties of Constantius—who arrived at Sirmium in the December of 357—is more revolting than the systematic employment of moral and physical anguish as a means of conquering the resolution of this old man, who had dared to rebuke him in the name of truth and justice. It was under cruel pressure, physical and moral, after knowing that his kinsfolk were to be persecuted on his account, and, according to report, after being actually subjected to blows and tortures, that Hosius gave way so far as to sign the "Blasphemia," which Hilary, either most unfairly, or from information seriously inaccurate, ascribes to him and to Potamius, as if their concern in it had been identical. The Arians who had extorted the concession afterwards added distinctly Anomœan language to the Blasphemia, and circulated it in that form as the creed of Hosius. Epiphanius's opinion, that he had been tricked into signing such a document, contrasts with the language of Hilary, to which Gibbon alludes when he mentions "the inhuman severity of some of the orthodox as regards an unfortunate old man," and which contrasts with the noble tenderness of the Athanasian statement, that "although he was with difficulty brought to hold communion with the Arians, he would *not* subscribe against Athanasius;" and on his death-bed, some few months later, he deplored the concession which had, so to speak, been wrung out of him, retracted it by anathematizing Arianism, and died, as Augustine declares against the Donatists, in communion with the Catholic Church. Whether he was in fact condemned by the Spanish Church and absolved by the Gallic, Augustine does not seem certain; but if this were so, he is

confident that the Spanish Church acted on a hasty impulse, and was well pleased, on better information, to withdraw its sentence against the man who, save for that hour of weakness, had been through a long life its pillar and glory. "He would have been honoured," says Tillemont, "as one of the greatest of saints, if he had lived *only* a hundred years: . . . a striking proof that we are capable of the greatest faults when God leaves us to ourselves."

Another lapse from constancy now followed, and in a quarter still more eminent. Liberius, says Athanasius, remained in his exile for two years. But his was a nature which could confront a despot better than it could bear up under captivity. He was enthusiastic, fervid, full of noble and loyal impulses, but lacking in the solidity of endurance. He was apt, one would think, to boast himself too much when putting on his armour. In 355 he had withstood Constantius to his face, had spurned the persuasions or menaces of his agent, and had written to Eusebius, Dionysius, and Lucifer in terms of hearty admiration. Now, at the end of 357, his mood was different. Athanasius says that the fear of a violent death had begun to work upon him; and according to a letter ascribed to him in the Hilarian Fragments, he was deprived of the society of his deacon Urbicus. The Emperor, indeed, in his visit to Rome in April, 357, had found it expedient to promise that Liberius should be restored; and this promise, when at first clogged, so to say, with the condition that he should preside over the Roman Church conjointly with Felix, had been received with a significant exclamation, which sounds like a condensation of St. Cyprian's language on the subject: "One God, one Christ, one Bishop!" It was, therefore, the Emperor's policy to reinstate the exile; but he resolved to impose on him terms of conformity. He had a ready agent in Fortunatian, bishop of Aquileia, who had been in 345 the host of Athanasius, had been looked upon with confidence by Liberius in 355, but in that same year had yielded, at Milan, to the urgency of Constantius. According to Jerome's account, he had already tried to persuade the Pope to follow his own example; and now, after Liberius had long known the bitterness of Thracian exile, he renewed his "solicitations," and "broke down" Liberius's resolution. And thus, according to the letters ascribed to Liberius in the Hilarian Fragments, beginning respectively, *Pro deifico*, *Quia scio*, and *Non doceo*, and the stern notes on those letters purporting to be by Hilary, Liberius, while still at Berœa, says in effect, "I have accepted the assurance

of the local bishop Demophilus that the Eastern bishops' confession of faith, made at Sirmium, is orthodox, and thereupon I have, without difficulty, acquiesced in it; I had already—in common with the Roman Church—admitted the justice of the sentence against Athanasius, and signified as much, through Fortunatian, to the Emperor; I am in communion with Ursacius, Valens, Germinius, Epictetus, and Auxentius; and, yet, after all, I am still detained in exile, and, as one almost driven to despair, must entreat that Italian bishops will exert their influence for my recall." Hilary's comment on this (assuming its genuineness) is that the creed which he accepted was a *perfidia*, and he anathematizes Liberius as a "prevaricator," or deserter of the cause to which he was pledged. Now, what Sirmian creed, representing a "false belief," so Arian as to satisfy the Western Arians who are named, and at the same time composed by Easterns, can be the one referred to?" Surely not the long Sirmian creed of 351, which Hilary treats as virtually orthodox! The so-called "second" (more properly third) Sirmian creed might indeed be called (as another Gallic bishop, Phœbadius, does call it) a "Perfidia," and Hilary himself calls it a "Blasphemia;" but then it was drawn up by a small number of *Western* bishops. And this difficulty remains even if we set aside, as not by Hilary, a note which includes among the authors of the "Perfidia" not only Valens and Ursacius, but Eudoxius, Theodore of Heraclea, who was dead when it was promulgated, and Basil of Ancyra, who was much nearer to Catholic lines than was consistent with acceptance of such a document. As we shall see, a Sirmian creed of practically Semi-Arian drift was drawn up in 358; but that will not suit the account in the Fragments, from which we gather that Liberius signed a thoroughly Arian document of Sirmian origin while still in detention at Berœa, and it seems probable that his lapse, whatever it was, took place in the winter of 357–8: so that Sozomen's statement—presently to be considered—which fixes on the creed of 358 as the formula in question, and Sirmium itself as the place, can hardly fit in with other evidence. The difficulty, which Tillemont calls "celebrated and important," is dealt with by Hefele somewhat trenchantly, and against the sense of most writers. He sets aside the three letters in question as not genuine; and it must be admitted that the first, in saying that Liberius had formerly "defended Athanasius" on the ground of Julius's letter in his favour, and had afterwards given up the

"defence" of his conduct, does not agree with Liberius's own account already mentioned, and that no solution meeting all the conditions of the problem has as yet been proposed. But the case does not rest on these letters alone: we have other proof, even if they are wholly or partially discredited. True, Athanasius neither says nor implies anything about his acceptance of a heretical formula; he only says that Liberius, under fear of death, "signed" a paper renouncing his communion. But Hilary himself, not in the Fragments, but in a pamphlet against Constantius, implies that Liberius's restoration was connected with some "impiety;" the two sectarians, Faustinus and Marcellinus, agree with the Fragments in so far as to say that he signed a "perfidia;" Philostorgius says that he "signed against the Homoousion;" and Jerome is unequivocally emphatic in two passages, one in his Chronicle, the other in his book *De Viris Illustribus*, to the effect that he signed a "heretical" creed, but under pressure, as the latter passage affirms, from Fortunatian. Here, then, is evidence, independent of the Fragments, as to a real and grave unfaithfulness on the part of Liberius; evidence which emboldens one of the most equitable of judges—the late Dr. Cazenove of Edinburgh—to say that "if any assert that Liberius did not fall, they may as well give up all belief in history." But it seems hardly possible to reach a satisfactory solution of the question, What precisely was it that he signed? which of the Arian formulas of the time did he, however reluctantly, accept?

The creed commonly known as the "Blasphemia" was a definite gain to the advanced wing of the Acacian party, who were substantially not far behind the Anomœan position. Another advantage was gained when, on the death of Leontius of Antioch—which probably took place in the late summer of 357—the court chamberlains contrived, as Newman expresses it, to transfer Eudoxius from Germanicia in Syria to the primatial see of "the Orient." He had been one of the Eusebian deputies charged to present the Macrostich to the Westerns in 345; and on that occasion, when called upon to anathematize Arianism, had left Milan in disgust. At the disastrous Council of Milan in 355, he did so much service to the Arian cause that, in Tillemont's phrase, "Constantius rewarded him by making him the gaoler of Lucifer;" and Gwatkin brands him as "perhaps the worst of the whole gang." Philostorgius, the Ultra-Arian historian, judges him rather favourably, evidently because, having been a Semi-Arian, he was practically drawn over

into Anomœanism, although he was too "timorous" to avow it. But the time of his translation to Antioch was in two ways momentous. In the first place, it brings before us a celebrated name—that of Cyril—who had for seven years occupied the see of Jerusalem. Ordained priest by the former bishop Maximus, and entrusted by him with the duty of instructing catechumen-postulants for baptism in 347 or 348, Cyril—who was separated from orthodoxy by a mere verbal difference, dislike or dread of the term Homoousion—was elected and consecrated as Maximus's successor "in 350 or early in 351." A story to the effect that he had previously accepted reordination from Arians is countenanced by Jerome, but may be set aside as due to prejudice and as "incredible." He soon won hearts by selling a rich vestment (given to his church by Constantine) to relieve the poor in a famine; but Acacius, his metropolitan, made this act a pretext for summoning him to trial, and Cyril for two years ignored the citation, partly because he knew Acacius to be a theological opponent, and partly from a not unnatural wish to assert the independence of the mother of all churches. At last he was deposed and banished; he took refuge with Silvanus of Tarsus, whose doctrinal position was exactly his own, and entered a formal appeal to a "higher court," *i.e.* to a greater council. This collision with Cyril made Acacius the more ready to join in a general attack on the Semi-Arians, which was being planned at the beginning of 358. A Council was held at Antioch, at which Eudoxius, Acacius, Uranius of Tyre, and others, condemned the Homoiousion as well as the Homoousion, and confirmed, by so doing, the Sirmian "Blasphemia," referring at the same time to the authority of the "Westerns" as having therein adopted this twofold negation.

This was a challenge which the Semi-Arians were not slow to answer. They had been alarmed and irritated by the "Blasphemia;" and some of their leading men—George of Laodicea (himself unstable in convictions), Mark of Arethusa, and others—had been personally aggrieved by not being consulted, or asked to co-operate, in the recent election to the Antiochene see. When Eudoxius ventured on excommunicating many Antiochenes who would not accept the resolutions of his late Council, George gave to these persons a letter for all the bishops whom Basil had invited to the dedication of a new church at Ancyra. This letter was a cry of indignation and distress. Aetius, it complained, had been treated with the highest distinction by the new bishop of Antioch. It was

indeed natural that the promotion of Eudoxius to that great see should be a signal for the return of Aetius from Alexandria. It was better to be the ruling spirit in the counsels of Eudoxius at Antioch, than to officiate as deacon under George of Alexandria; and Aetius's pupils had received ordination and all manner of encouragement from Eudoxius. George of Laodicea exhorted the bishops who should read his letter to hold a meeting for the deliverance of Antioch from Anomœanism. Let Aetius be put under ban, and his newly ordained followers be deposed from the ministry. The letter was read at Ancyra, and produced a great impression on the twelve prelates assembled. A little before the Easter of 358, which fell on the 12th of April, the Council of Ancyra, which was, in more than one sense, another Dedication Council, took into consideration the facts stated by George, and the "blasphemous" character of the Sirmian creed of 357. More than those twelve bishops, whose signatures are given by Epiphanius, were probably present at this Semi-Arian gathering, which drew up a string of nineteen anathemas, to the following effect (Hilary mentions only twelve):—

1. Against all who denied the Homoiousion, and, falsely employing the terms Father and Son, regarded the "Son" as in fact the creature of the "Father."

2. Against deniers of the Son's personality. So 6, 8.

3. Against all who called the Son "Wisdom," but a Wisdom separate from the Father's Essence.

5, 7. Against maintainers of the Anomoion. So 9.

10. Against identifiers of "He begat" with "He created me," *i.e.* against all who made the Son a mere creature.

11. Against all who reduced the likeness of the Father and the Son to a mere likeness of action. So 12.

13. Against any who so interpreted the Homoiousion as to merge the Son in the Father, or make Him a part of, or an efflux from the Father.

14. Against any who, while guarding the personal distinction, rejected the Homoiousion.

15. Against all who did not admit the Filiation to be before all time and beyond all thought. So 16.

19. Against all who asserted the Homoousion.

These decrees were comments, as it were, on a long dogmatic exposition, which was, in part, luminously orthodox, enforcing the point so much urged by Athanasius, that real Sonship excluded

the notion of createdness—that Father and Son stood in one relation, Creator and creature in another. Misleading senses of "Son" and "Father" were noticed and excluded: Christ, said the bishops, is called Son in a very different sense from the children of God by adoption. The application of mere "human wisdom" to such a mystery was condemned, as plainly contrary to the teaching of St. Paul, "Where is the wise?" "O the depth of the riches!" The true force of Old Testament sayings about the Divine Wisdom was brought out by the Apostles, whose teaching involved the Homoiousion, but not the Homoousion; for that formula the Ancyran Council still regarded as identifying, in a Sabellian fashion, the Son's personality with the Father's. The letter referred to the authorities of the Dedication Council, that of Philippopolis under its usurped name of "Sardican," and the Sirmian Council of 351. The rejection of Homoousion by this Council showed that the Semi-Arians were far from being ready to return to the Nicene Creed in their indignation at the more pronounced Arianism which had now called out their protest. They were quite confident of the tenableness of their peculiar position; and as Constantius was now staying at Sirmium, they sent thither four envoys to request his interposition against Eudoxius, Aetius, and the Ultra-Arians generally. These envoys were Basil; Eustathius of Sebaste, distinguished by his shiftings of theological position, the fanatical asceticism censured by a council at Gangra, and his subsequent hostility to St. Basil the Great; Eleusius, whom Hilary praises, and whom we shall meet with again as a dogmatic Semi-Arian, but who had had some share in the violences of Macedonius; and Leontius, a priest who had served in the palace as a personal attendant on Constantius. The deputies were but just in time. Asphalius, a priest of Antioch, and a zealot for Arianism, had obtained a letter from Constantius in support of Eudoxius, and was returning for Antioch, when the Ancyran deputies by their representatives changed the Emperor's fitful mind. He had, apparently, been induced to approve the "Blasphemia;" but now, on further information, he acquiesced in the Semi-Arian denunciations of the Anomoion, and wrote another letter to the Antiochenes, withdrawing from the reluctant hands of Asphalius the one which he had entrusted to him. The new letter contained a declamation against Aetius, a declaration (hardly credible) that the promotion of Eudoxius took place without the Emperor's sanction, a profession of Homoiousian belief, and an exhortation to eschew

Anomœanism. But this was not enough: the Semi-Arians made further use of their opportunity, and "compelled," as Hilary expresses it, those bishops who had taken part in the issuing of the "Blasphemia" to "confess their ignorance and mistake, and by a fresh signature to condemn their own deed." And the Ancyran deputies, who had taken the liberty of abbreviating, in the copy which they brought, their council's list of doctrinal anathemas, and especially of omitting the bold condemnation of the Nicene test-phrase, procured, according to Sozomen, the Emperor's sanction for a new formulary, compiled from the decrees of the first Council of Antioch against Paul of Samosata, the Creed of the Dedication Council of 341, and the Sirmian condemnation of Photinus in 351. This formulary was illustrated by a letter from "Eastern bishops of the Semi-Arian party," in which the Semi-Arian principle was laid down, and reasons given for objecting to the Homoousion, as that it implied the sense which Paul of Samosata had professed to find in it, *i.e.* the notion of one prior essence, and two others formed by partition of the prior one; that it was rejected by the first Council of Antioch as involving Sabellianism; and that it was not found in Scripture. Of these grounds the first was an unworthy recognition of a heresiarch's despicable fallacy; the second was inconsistent with the first, for the Council's action was closely related to Paul's cavil; the third was that Acacian position, already described, which was manifestly not tenable for a moment by advocates of the Homoiousion. It was to this composite Sirmian formulary that Sozomen supposed Liberius to have given his consent. Sozomen knew nothing, it seems, or else believed nothing, of any submission made by Liberius at Bercœa, or of any recognition by him, at any time, of any gross form of Arianism. The statement of this historian is that Liberius was summoned to Sirmium, was there urged to give up the Homoousion, and there, in company with four African bishops, and with Valens, Ursacius, Germinius, and the Easterns then present, accepted the composite Semi-Arian formulary above mentioned, but also cleared himself of the imputation (set on foot by Anomœans at Antioch) of having admitted the Anomoion, by presenting, with the approval of the other bishops, a confession of faith, excommunicating all who denied that the Son was like to the Father "in essence and in all respects," in other words, all who fall short of high Semi-Arianism. The story is highly suspicious, for how could Valens and Ursacius be

acting with high Semi-Arians? Yet Tillemont, Döllinger, and Newman, while accepting the genuineness of the letters in the Hilarian Fragments, inconsistently tack on to it Sozomen's account of the circumstances of Liberius's lapse as not only correct, but complete; whereas it is clear that to sign the composite Semi-Arian document would not be such an acceptance of downright heresy as Jerome's and Hilary's undoubted words imply; and further, that if he had already made the greater concession, the lesser would have been needless. Even if it could be abated to this extent, the fault of Liberius would be confessedly a fall. Hefele admits that the silence of Socrates or Theodoret cannot outweigh fourth-century evidence; and even if, as this great Roman Catholic scholar considers, he retained his own faith in the essential Godhead of the Son, he consented to surrender the word by which the Nicene Council had guarded that truth. Moreover, whatever was the precise form of Liberius's concession to heterodoxy, there can be no doubt whatever as to the capacity in which he made it. He was not approached as an individual, but as one who deemed himself still bishop of Rome *de jure*, and who on certain conditions might again become bishop of Rome *de facto*. As such, he yielded to pressure; and while, of course, he was not pretending to instruct the Christian world *ex cathedrâ*, he did unquestionably compromise his own see, because he officially abandoned the Nicene position. "If," it has been pointedly said, "Liberius, as a private Christian, remained probably quite orthodox, as Roman pontiff he publicly, officially, failed." He returned to Rome, with the Emperor's sanction, in the beginning of August, 358, bearing with him, as we may well believe from his subsequent conduct, a heavy heart, an uneasy conscience, in the midst of what Jerome calls his "triumphant entry." Felix was compelled to leave the city, and lived in retirement on his own estate until his death in 365, consoled, we must suppose, by the sympathy of his own partisans, of whom the chief was a priest named Damasus.

Such was the memorable Semi-Arian triumph in the May of 358; it was followed up by the banishment of the leading Ultra-Arians—as Aetius, who with Eunomius, lately ordained deacon at Antioch, was banished into Phrygia, just when they were preparing to memorialise Constantius against Basil and his party. Theophilus "the Indian," an indefatigable missionary of the Arian faith, had been exiled in 354, according to the Anomœan historian, on account of his connection with the unfortunate Cæsar Gallus:

he had afterwards been recalled, and was alleged to have effected a supernatural cure of Constantius's beloved wife Eusebia; but he was now, Philostorgius tells us, sent to Heraclea in Pontus on a revived charge of disaffection, while Eudoxius, after receiving an order to leave Antioch, sought refuge in his native Armenia. Seventy other persons were sent into exile; and, as Newman puts it, "the Semi-Arians, elated by their success with the Emperor, followed it up by obtaining his consent for an Œcumenical Council, in which the faith of the Church should definitively be declared for good," with a special view to the suppression of Anomœanism.

CHAPTER XIV.

ARIMINUM AND SELEUCIA.

A NEW General Council!—this was the prospect opening before the Eastern Church in the summer of 358; and the first place thought of for the Council was Nicæa. But the "Homoiousian" party had a natural repugnance to the scene of the great "Homoousian" council; and Nicomedia was selected in its stead. Letters of summons went forth among the bishops, and many prelates had actually begun their journey to the proposed meeting-place, when the city was laid in ruins, on August 24, by a terrific earthquake, the results of which were exaggerated by rumours, but were sufficiently serious, involving the destruction of the magnificent church, and the death of two prelates, one of them being Cecropius, the bishop of the city. Again was Nicæa suggested, this time by Basil; and Constantius at first agreed, and ordered that the bishops who were not disabled by bodily weakness should meet there in the early part of the summer, while those who could not take the journey should send priests and deacons as their representatives; also, that ten delegates should be sent for the Western churches and ten for the Eastern, to report to the Emperor the resolutions at which the Council might have arrived, "in order that *he* might judge whether they were in accordance with Scripture, and carry out the practical conclusions as might seem to him best." So thoroughly was the whole affair arranged, and on lines of "Byzantine" imperial supremacy, when not only was Nicæa again put out of consideration for fear of the mischief done to all Bithynia by the earthquake, but the victory secured by the Semi-Arians, at Ancyra, over their adversaries of the Acacian and Anomœan sections was suddenly neutralised by representations made to the facile Emperor on the part of some old Arian partisans, who induced him to recall the banished Anomœans, and to

break up the intended assembly into two councils representing the East and the West. The policy of "divide and govern" was a promising one for the enemies of Semi-Arianism; it might avert the danger of an œcumenical condemnation of the Anomoion and of its advocates. The Western Council, it was now resolved, should be at Ariminum; for the Eastern, Tarsus was thought of, and then Ancyra, but for some time nothing was settled. It was while matters were in this state that Hilary, in Phrygia, wrote his work "On the Councils," or "On the Faith of the Easterns," in acknowledgment of letters which he had received from his brother bishops in Gaul, Germany, and Britain, in reprobation of the "Blasphemia," and with the triple purpose of informing them as to the doctrinal statements of the Eastern Semi-Arians, of inducing them to act in concert with the Semi-Arians, at the impending Councils, against the common enemy, and also of overcoming the difficulties which, through the force of prejudice, had prevented the Semi-Arians from accepting the Homoousion. The task which he thus undertook was a very delicate one, and involved a liberal use of *benigna interpretatio;* it required him to put the best interpretation on Semi-Arian proceedings, to represent the Semi-Arians as on their way to the full truth, and as separated by a real difference of principle from the Ultra-Arian impiety, and even from such a position as Hosius had consented to adopt, and also to warn against a Sabellian misuse of the Homoousion, and to explain "likeness in essence" as in effect implying co-equality. When this—which occupies far the larger part of his treatise—was accomplished, he turned to the Semi-Arians, and urged them, as Christians who meant to recognise Christ's Sonship in its true and essential divinity, who in effect were "not Arians," but *now* "desirous of holding apostolic and evangelical doctrine"—to reconsider their objections against the Nicene term, and to think whether it were not, in its true sense, the full expression of the idea which they were wont to associate with the Homoiousion; whether, in a word, believing what they did, they could consistently ignore, still less proscribe, that term which he, indeed, strange to say, had never heard of until he was "going into exile," but which, when he heard it, commended itself to him as expressive of his own baptismal belief. With all his earnest, even passionate longing to bring Westerns and Semi-Arians together, Hilary was too truthful to keep back his conviction that Semi-Arian formulas were inadequate, were not free from suspicion of heresy, nor from

language offensive to pious ears. Taken at its best, he is constrained to say, Semi-Arianism is unsatisfactory, it wants correcting and filling up, and that can only be done by its becoming frankly Catholic: if you own the Son as "like in essence," if you feel that it is not enough to acknowledge a moral likeness of will or action, nothing ought to hinder you from owning Him as "co-essential;" and until you do so, you are not safe. "This," says Tillemont, "is the finest part of his work:" it is, we may add, truly Athanasian; but, as an appeal, it had little success.

It was not until May in 359 that Basil gave up the attempt to make his brethren agree as to the best place for the Eastern Council. He then resolved to take the Emperor's judgment by way of settling the matter; and he visited the court at Sirmium, where he found several bishops, including Mark, George of Alexandria, and Valens. It was there determined that the Easterns should meet at Seleucia in Cilicia, on the river Calycadnus, a city distinguished from its various namesakes by the epithet Tracheotis, as situated in a "rugged" district, but populous and prosperous, though exposed to the attacks of Isaurians. But at this new Sirmian conference the Homœans won a new move in their game. "Would it not be well," it was asked, "to have ready for the Councils some draft of a doctrinal formulary?" The Semi-Arian members of the conference could not deny it; and Mark of Arethusa, as a leading Semi-Arian, was appointed, by general vote, to draw up a creed. He seems, however, to have allowed other hands to take part in the work; and the result was "a patchwork of two views," in which the Acacian predominated, for the term Homoiousion was proscribed. The creed began: "The Catholic faith was published in the presence of our sovereign . . . Constantius, Augustus, *eternal*, in the consulate of Eusebius and Hypatius, at Sirmium, on the 11th of the Calends of June." This was May 22, the Whitsun-eve of 359, and it was not until night had set in that the wording was really settled. The Son was owned in this paper as "begotten, not only before all time or age, but before all beginning, and all conceivable essence," and as "like in all things to the Father, according to the Scriptures;" but all mention of "essence," as regarded the Father or the Son, was to be laid aside as non-scriptural, although there was a respectful reference to those "fathers" who in their simplicity had employed a term which had proved so liable to misconstruction. One striking phrase in

this creed (borrowed from Job xxxviii. 17, LXX.) referred to the descent into Hades: "At whose presence the doorkeepers of Hades trembled." This "Dated Creed," as it is called from its preamble—which became the mark of some rather strained and unfair taunting from the pen of Athanasius—was not signed by all the bishops present without some difficulty. The Semi-Arians felt that they had yielded the key of the position. Basil, hoping to neutralise this result, appended to his signature an elaborate note, declaring that by "like in all things" he meant, "like not only in will, but in 'hypostasis,' in existence, in being;" he went as near as he could to saying "in essence," and defended "ousia" as implied in "He who *is*." Valens, on the other hand, was loth to accept the explanatory "in all things;" he would, of course, have preferred simply to say "like,"—which would virtually leave room for Anomœanism, for the likeness might be construed as merely a moral one, such as any angel, or even any holy man, might have towards the Creator: and, in signing, he at first left out "in all things,"—whereupon Constantius compelled him to add the words. For, whatever influence Valens might have regained over the Emperor, he had not as yet made him quite forget his Semi-Arian sympathies. Hilary, perhaps, was right in saying that Constantius, soon after the Council of Ancyra, was "offended" by its condemnation of those who made the Father's existence prior to the Son's; but he still clung to a higher idea of the Son's being than any that proper Arianism would recognise—he still considered himself, no longer indeed a Homoiousian, but far enough from an Anomœan. Here then, at last, we close the series of Councils of Sirmium. The first had condemned Photinus in 348; the second had produced the long Sirmian Creed in 351; the third had sanctioned the "Blasphemia" in 357; the fourth had adopted the Semi-Arian compilation in 358; and the fifth had agreed on the Dated Creed in the May of 359.

And now, while Constantius was taking up an Acacian line, but was, doubtless, valuing himself on his accurate and intelligent moderation—while the Ultra-Arians were estimating what they had gained, the Semi-Arians what they had lost, in this Whitsuntide conference—the Western Council was opened in May at Ariminum on the Hadriatic, in Northern Umbria, some distance to the south-east of Ravenna, a city which was associated with Cæsar's march after the crossing of the Rubicon, and had become a colony in 268. Officials of the government had collected more than four

hundred bishops from Italy, Illyricum, Africa, Spain, Gaul, and Britain: provisions were assigned to them at the public cost, but nearly all the orthodox prelates preferred to live at their own charges; only three British bishops, who were exceptionally poor (a point which throws light on the social position of their church), set what Sulpicius calls "a noble example" by choosing to be supported by the treasury rather than by the contributions of their brethren. A very large majority of the bishops—in spite of the persecution of 355—were attached to the Nicene faith: there were but eighty who were Arians. The former took possession of the church; the latter, "of set purpose," met for prayers in a separate building. In the church were to be seen no delegates from Liberius, but several bishops of high reputation, as Restitutus of Carthage, Servatius, Phœbadius, Grecianus, Musonius from Africa; among the minority Auxentius of Milan, and Epictetus, were prominent, and were doubtless active co-operators with Valens, who had brought from Sirmium his copy of the Dated Creed, and an imperial letter (dated May 27) desiring the prelates to settle the question of doctrine, and then send ten deputies to his court, who might confer with the deputies from the Eastern Council. "Reason does not permit," said the Emperor, "that in your Council anything should be decreed respecting the Easterns: any such decree, if you make it, will vanish away, and be of no effect." He had instructed Taurus, the prætorian prefect of Italy, to keep the bishops together until they were agreed on the point of doctrine; and this, in one sense, was soon achieved. When the debate began, on July 21, Valens, Ursacius, Germinius, Auxentius, Caius, and Demophilus of Berœa came forward, and proposed that all previously published formularies should be put aside, and the Dated Creed adopted. Valens read it in its original Latin, and added, "It is sanctioned by the Emperor; what need have we of any further documents? Here is a plain Scriptural confession, expressing the true faith without introducing those details of individual opinion, which multiply controversies and puzzle the simple folk." "It is true indeed," replied many of the Catholics, "that we want no long discussion about creeds. The Nicene Creed is our Creed:—to exclude all doctrinal innovations is our purpose. Is it yours also? if so, join with us in condemning Arianism." The Arianizers of course refused. "Let us read, then," rejoined the majority, "the Nicene Creed, and all the subsequent creeds, and test the latter by the Nicene standard. Thus only shall we arrive at a final decision of

the question, by adhering to the traditions of our fathers—by standing firm on the ground of the ancient faith." The various creeds having been read, the bishops, by a great majority, resolved that the creed proposed by Valens was a device for annulling the Nicene settlement. "Let it be decreed that nothing new take the place of the old and received Creed. The name of 'substance,' and the thing intended by the name, cannot be given up: the Catholic Church, with her salutary teaching, has been ever accustomed to confess both." Thereupon, Grecianus moved as follows: "The Catholic Council, dearest brethren, has shown all due tolerance towards Ursacius, Valens, Germinius, Caius, Auxentius, who, by so often changing their faith, have disturbed all churches, and are now trying to insinuate their heretical notions into Christian minds. They want to subvert the Nicene Creed, and have brought us one which we could not lawfully accept. They were long ago pronounced heretics by us: now, again, speak your mind about them!" The answer was, "We resolve that the heretics be condemned." It was done, and eleven anathemas were pronounced not only against Arianism, but against those Sabellian and Photinian errors which in other directions were as fatal to true belief. The concluding anathema is characteristic in its comprehensive and laconic stringency: "If any other blasphemies, by Arius or by any one else, have been discovered, we anathematize them likewise." A letter was addressed to Constantius, explaining the principle on which the Council had acted: "We deemed it a crime to mutilate what belonged to the saints and those who had sat at Nicæa, and who did but uphold the doctrine of their Catholic predecessors." The Dated Creed was described as "containing much perverse doctrine:" and the Emperor was entreated to consider favourably the statements which would be made to him on behalf of the Council, and to allow it now to break up, its work being done. Very many of the bishops detained at Ariminum were old and poor, and were wanted at home by their flocks: let the Emperor permit them to return, but above all let him sanction no change in the doctrine recognised by his father, and spare the bishops, in future, the needless toil and vexation of attending councils which were not requisite for the cause of religion, and which rather interfered with their proper work.

The letter was carried to Constantius by fourteen delegates, who, unfortunately, were "young men with little learning and little caution;" the Arians sent ten of their own body, "elderly men,"

says Sulpicius, "imbued with the poison of a false faith, and strong in subtlety and ability,"—or, in Hooker's phrase, "wary and practised veterans." The Catholic delegates, among whom was the bishop of Carthage, were instructed to make no terms with Arians, and to reserve the whole case for the Council. They did not make such good speed as not to be outstripped by the Arian deputies, among whom were Valens and Ursacius; and when Constantius heard the report of the latter, he became, says Socrates, "much incensed against the Council, and detained its deputies for a long time without an answer." He sent, indeed, a brief letter, by three messengers, to the Council, explaining that the Persian war absorbed his thoughts (it was, indeed, in this autumn of 359 that Sapor, after a siege of seventy-three days, took Amida), and that he had directed the delegates to await his return at Hadrianople. To this the bishops at Ariminum replied by an assurance that they should not depart from their resolution, and by again entreating the "most religious Emperor," in mere humanity, to send them home before the winter had set in.

So ended the first of the four scenes, into which the drama of the two Councils appears to divide itself. The second opens at Seleucia on Monday, the 27th of September. When the Eastern Council met, there were about a hundred and sixty bishops present: of these, according to Hilary, a hundred and five were Semi-Arians, as George of Laodicea, Eleusius, Sophronius from Paphlagonia, Macedonius, Silvanus of Tarsus, Basil, Eustathius, and Cyril as an appellant against his sentence of deposition; but of these, Basil and Macedonius arrived after the opening of the Council. Hilary adds that "there were as many blasphemers as suited Constantius;" in effect, we must suppose, about forty Acacians altogether, including Acacius, Patrophilus, Eudoxius, George of Alexandria, Uranius of Tyre. Of the orthodox party there were very few representatives—some twelve Egyptian prelates who dared to resist their *de facto* primate, and Hilary, now in the fourth year of his Phrygian exile, and summoned by virtue of the general order for the attendance of all bishops resident in the East: he was questioned as to his faith, and on proving by his profession of Nicene belief—as Sulpicius tells us, that the Gallic Church did not hold a Sabellian "*trionymam solitarii Dei unionem*"—he was permitted to take his seat in the Council. From one phrase in the opening of Athanasius's work on these two Councils, it has been inferred that he himself literally "saw" the proceedings at

Seleucia; but this is improbable. Those proceedings were watched and controlled, in the Emperor's name, by Leonas, an officer of his household. They began in remarkable contrast to the Ariminian Council's silence about questions of personal conduct. There, the enemies of Athanasius had said nothing on the subject of his character; here, many accusations were, at the outset, urged against many bishops, and against Basil, and Macedonius, and Patrophilus, whose coming was daily expected, and who had excused themselves for tardiness. The bishops were divided in opinion as to whether the question of doctrine or the personal accusations should take precedence: the imperial letter, through some inadvertence, had given contradictory instructions on this head; and it is said that a wish on the part of the Acacian section to avoid charges brought against them induced them (although they had lately professed agreement with the Semi-Arian Macedonius) to league themselves with the Anomœans properly so called, and to urge a resolution for entering first on the question of doctrine. Accordingly, the Council saw itself divided into two main parties. One, the larger, was for the Nicene Creed *minus* the Homoousion, or, if that were disliked, for the Dedication Creed of 341. The other was for a vague "Homœan" creed, such as that which had been framed at the Whitsun-eve conference of Sirmium, the appropriateness of which for Ultra-Arian purposes was illustrated by its being now referred to by such men as the Alexandrian George and the Antiochene Eudoxius. The dispute—in which the Arians maintained that the Lord, as Son, was a creature—waxed hot and lasted long; at length, while the evening was closing in, Silvanus shouted out with vehement energy, "We want no new creed—let us confirm the creed of the Dedication." The Acacians, on this, withdrew; the "Lucianic" Antiochene, or "Dedication" creed, was read, and adopted on the following morning, September 28, after the doors of the church in which the Council met had been closed. Among those who signed the formulary were some deacons and readers, representing their absent bishops. Acacius and his friends spent this second day in protesting against what they called an irregular and clandestine act, in framing a new formulary, and embodying it in a declaration submitted to Leonas, and to the provincial governor Lauricius. This paper was dated September 28; the persons who signed it began their statement by complaining that in the preceding day's session, some bishops had been irregularly admitted to seats in the Council, others had been excluded, or

silenced, without warrant, and the Council had become a scene of disorder. They then stated their personal approval of the Dedication Creed, but urged that "Homoousion" and "Homoiousion" had been found productive of dissension, and ought to be laid aside as non-Scriptural. But, they added—with the readiness that Acacius showed to abandon, for a time and professedly, his more outspoken friends—"We anathematize the Anomoion, and regard its maintainers as aliens from the Church." Epiphanius says that this was a "snare set by crafty hunters; for when the Acacians were by themselves, they would say that the Son was like the Father only as a picture was like its original." On this occasion they produced a formulary of their own; it was not the Dated Creed, though it professed to be equivalent to it. The Dated Creed, on the one hand, did not, like this formulary, condemn the Anomoion; but, on the other hand, this creed did not, like the Dated, define the Son to be like the Father "in all things:" it only said, "We plainly confess the Son to be like the Father, according to the apostle's words concerning the Son, 'Who is an image of the invisible God.'" In fact, the Dated Creed, as Athanasius tells us, had been withdrawn from circulation, and its copies suppressed by means of "Martinian the notary," probably because the date referring to the Consulships, and the title of "eternal" given to the Emperor, had provoked severe criticism.

The Acacian declaration and creed received the signatures of thirty-eight bishops, given by Epiphanius, and of Patrophilus, who was not an Anomœan. On the third day, September 29, Macedonius and Basil having arrived, Leonas endeavoured to bring the two parties together. But the Acacians protested against opening the third session until all the bishops who were under any accusation had gone out, as well as those who had been, like Cyril, deposed. The Semi-Arian majority, not wishing to give Acacius any pretext for breaking up the assembly before the question of Anomœanism could be thoroughly dealt with, yielded this point to their opponents. Then it was that Leonas said, with diplomatic dexterity, "Let us read this paper, which Acacius has put into my hands." The majority knew nothing of the nature of the paper when he made this announcement; for Leonas, being in league with Acacius, had kept secret the preparation of the new Acacian creed. He proceeded, accordingly, with the reading: a great disturbance ensued, for the main body of the prelates, as we have seen, were for adhering to the Dedication formulary properly so called, and

Sophronius exclaimed, "If to make an exposition of the faith means to promulgate, day after day, our private opinions, we shall never get at the truth." The debate was adjourned until the next day, September 30, when Acacius, justly enough, reminded the Semi-Arians that they had frequently made creeds of their own, in deviation from that of Nicæa; and the rejoinder of Eleusius, "We have to stand by the creed of our fathers,"—meaning, of course, the Antiochene, not the Nicene,—only showed the weakness of the Semi-Arian position; for, as Socrates remarks, it invited the retort, "Are not the Nicene bishops 'fathers' in a truer sense?" The question then, our historians tell us, took a somewhat different form. What, it was asked by the Semi-Arians (naturally desirous of turning the tables on their opponents), was really meant by the Homoion? In what did the "likeness" consist—in essence, or in will? Was it a substantial similarity, or only a moral one? The Acacians of course answered, "It is a likeness in will, not in essence." "What?" rejoined the Semi-Arians; "have not you, Acacius, in your own published works, called the Son 'like the Father in *all* things'?" Acacius could seldom have found himself in so weak a position as when he had to reply, "It is not fair to quote a man's books against himself;" and after a long debate Eleusius said, "We are not concerned with personal recriminations; we have not to ask why Basil or Mark accepted the Dated Creed, nor need we examine this new formulary; our duty is simply to reaffirm the Dedication Creed, and expel those who reject it:" whereupon Leonas thought it time to close the sitting. Next day, October 1, when requested to come into the Council, he flatly declined to do so. "I was deputed," he said, "to preside over a Council which should be of one mind. It is hopeless to expect this Council to be of such a character, and I shall come among you no more. Go you to the church, if you will, and chatter to your hearts' content." While he spoke, the Acacians were in the very house which he occupied; and they, like himself, refused to return to the Council. Much fruitless negotiation followed; the majority summoned the Acacians to attend the inquiry which was now to be made into the case of Cyril: the reply was sometimes, "We will meet you here, not in the church;" sometimes, "We, not you, are appointed by the Emperor to judge the accused bishops." At length the majority saw that they were, in fact, determined not to join in any further business—not to go into the case of Cyril's appeal, not to meet

charges brought against themselves, not to accept the Creed of Antioch. Accordingly, sentence of deposition was passed, in the church, against the contumacions Acacius, George of Alexandria, Eudoxius, Patrophilus, Uranius, and others of that party: excommunication being also decreed against Asterius, a prelate of some see unknown, and eight others, until they should make good their defence. Cyril was doubtless restored. Anianus was consecrated to the see of Antioch, but soon afterwards fell into Acacian hands, and was sent by Leonas into exile. Protest was made, but in vain; and then the Council sent its deputies to Constantius, among whom were Basil, Eustathius, Silvanus, Eleusius; but they were outstripped by the deputies of the Acacian party, who also lost no time in securing, on their arrival, the influence of important palace-officers. This was the end of the proceedings at Seleucia. Thus far, then, orthodoxy had triumphed in the Western Council, and Semi-Arianism, as opposed to proper Arianism, in the Eastern. But the end was not yet.

Another scene, in fact, had opened, before any deputies from Seleucia could reach the court. After the Ariminian Council's deputies arrived at Constantinople, they were ordered to meet the Arian deputies from Ariminum at Nicè in Thrace—a place chosen for the convenient similarity of its name to Nicæa. There the Catholics were harassed, importuned, intimidated, and beguiled into the acceptance of the Homoion in its vaguest form. This took place, as an extant document in Hilary's "Fragments" informs us, on the 10th of October, and Socrates is mistaken in dating it after the Ariminian Council had broken up. Restitutus, speaking for his brethren, declared that on fuller inquiry it appeared that Valens and Ursacius were orthodox; and gave formal adhesion to another creed, which omitted "in all things" when affirming the "likeness," and proscribed "hypostasis" as well as "essence." With this new edition, so to speak, of the "Dated" formulary, which might by a paltry juggle be represented as "Nicene," the Catholic deputies—Catholic, indeed, no longer—were sent back to their Council, the proceedings of which they had already been induced to repudiate as null and void. Constantius at the same time wrote to the Council in a thoroughly Acacian sense, and ordered Taurus to keep all the prelates at Ariminum until those who refused the new "Nicene" formula should be reduced to fifteen, who were then to be sent into exile.

But when the deputies returned to Ariminum, the great

majority of the bishops disowned their act, and refused to communicate with them; although they pleaded that they had signed the new creed under pressure. On the other hand, the Arianizers in the Council wrote in exultation to their Eastern friends: "We always held this belief, and we are now in union with you as holding it." To Constantius they also wrote a letter, which Tillemont describes as the meanest and most infamous of documents; they professed "entire obedience to the Easterns and to his directions," alluded to "the rest" of the bishops as "being wont to use the terms Ousia and Homoousion in regard to God and His Son," and then supplicated the imperial "kindness" not to detain them along with "those who were tainted with perverse doctrine," but to "send them home to their flocks" as having satisfactorily proved their own orthodoxy, by assenting to the prohibition of the word Ousia: "Assist, O gracious Emperor, those who worship none but God the Father, through our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of His glory,"—in this passage clearly implying that they were *not*, properly speaking, worshippers of Christ. The Catholic-minded bishops held out for a time; but gradually their patience and clear-sightedness began to fail them. The prospect of indefinite detention, of a winter on the shore of the Hadriatic, of financial difficulties as to maintenance, of the relentless vindictiveness of a heterodox autocrat, perturbed their judgment and their sense of religious duty. The Arianizers pressed them hard with arguments against "this idle standing-out for a word." "You desire, no doubt, the union of all good Christians. Well, be sure of this—that term 'ousia,' and its compounds, are the hindrances to such union. The Eastern bishops have made up their minds to call the Son simply 'like' to the Father, in order to secure peace. Why must you insist on being at discord with them on this matter? Why cannot you be content with what satisfies them? Come, tell us: Is it Christ that you worship—is it Christ that you want to serve—or is it the word Homoousion?" By these arguments, the Arianizers, who had now got possession of the church of Ariminum, and excluded the Catholics from it, overcame the resolution of nearly all their former adversaries. The bishops on the Catholic side, says Sulpicius, went over in troops to the other side, until only twenty were left. Among these the Gallicans, Phœbadius and Servatius, were prominent. The prefect did his utmost to make them yield. He first threatened, and then implored them—even, it is said, with

tears—to "take a more moderate line. The bishops," he urged, "have now been shut up for more than six months within this town. Many of them are poor, all of them feel the rigour of the winter; none of them have any hope of release while you twenty remain obstinate. What is to be the end? Why will you not do as others have done? Why cannot this large number of adhesions to the Emperor's creed be your authority for accepting it?" Phœbadius answered firmly, "You can send us into exile; you can inflict on us what you will; but a creed framed by Arians we will not accept." For several days this attack and defence went on. At last Valens begged to suggest that it was a mistake to call this creed heretical. "It has been put forward by the Easterns with the Emperor's authority; to reject it will involve a grave responsibility: your own delegates," he probably added, "have signed it; and if you think it inadequate in any respect, add what you like to it, and I engage that we will accept your additions." Phœbadius, who had begun, Sulpicius says, to show signs of wavering, thought this proposal a happy outlet from the difficulty. He and Servatius set to work to frame some anathemas which might fairly bar out Arianism, and secure at least the substantial truth which was to be no longer guarded by the Homoousion. These condemnatory propositions were directed against "the whole false doctrine of Arius;" but, according to the text of Sulpicius, they did not imply that the Son was co-equal, and "without beginning" of existence. Then Valens, by way of contribution, offered an anathema of his own, or a statement equivalent to an anathema, against those who said "that the Son of God was a creature *like the other creatures*." In this, of course, as Sulpicius says, "there lay concealed a wile; for in these words, which denied the Son to be a creature like the rest, He was yet asserted to be a creature, though superior to the rest." But at the time this quibble was not detected. The small remnant of bishops who had not given way until these additions were made to the new symbol had more of the dove, says Tillemont, than of the serpent—were "deceived," says St. Ambrose, "by the first sound of the phrase," and fell unsuspectingly into this snare, which, in fact, might have been avoided by any one who knew—as, probably, few at Ariminum did know—that the designation of the Son as "God's perfect creature, but not as one of the creatures," had been employed by Arius himself, in a letter to Alexander, written before the Nicene Council. Thus, the general result seemed to be a compromise: neither party,

says Sulpicius, "could think it had won all along the line:" the creed now adopted, and which must henceforth be called the Ariminian, was itself a "Homœan" symbol; but the appended anathemas appeared to secure Catholic truth. However, the people outside the Council suspected that Valens had been playing some Arian trick, and he found it desirable first to disclaim Arianism in the presence of Taurus, and next, on a day when bishops and laity were assembled in the church, to make a more emphatic disclaimer on a prearranged plan. What followed we learn from Jerome, who had consulted public church archives. Musonius, from the African province of Byzacena, who presided at this gathering on the score of his venerable age, proposed that some prelate should recite the various points of Arianism, in order that they might all be publicly condemned. Thereupon Claudius, a bishop from Picenum, began to read the propositions popularly attributed to Valens. But Valens interrupted him—"They are none of mine;" and proceeded to recite them with anathemas, all the bishops responding to each, "Anathema!" as Valens repeated them in order; while clapping of hands and stamping of feet welcomed this "evidence" of his orthodoxy, and many voices professed regret for doubts previously entertained respecting it. Special reassurance would probably be derived from the condemnation of "any one who did not say that the Son was eternal with the Father." Claudius then added, that Valens had forgotten one point, which, to leave no doubt remaining, it would be well for the bishops then to guard: "Anathema to him that says, The Son was before all ages, but not before all *time*,—so as to imply that something was prior to Him." This was at once accepted, as were some other propositions on points as to which Valens had been suspected. The strange facility of the Westerns in regard to some of the professedly anti-Arian statements which Valens had now joined in making, the slowness in discernment, the credulous catching at such equivocal safeguards, may partly be accounted for by the Latin deficiency in theological acuteness, and partly, no doubt, by the effect of weariness and fear on the minds of men who under less searching trial had contended well for orthodoxy.

This was the end of the Council of Ariminum, the "shameful close," as Sulpicius expresses it, of what had "begun so well;" and an epoch fruitful to scandals and confusions, from which the Church in the West was slow to recover, and which are best described in the famous words of Jerome, "Ingemuit orbis, et

Arianum se esse miratus est," must be fixed at this memorable winter of 359. Before the close of the Ariminian proceedings, however, the mind of Constantius had been preoccupied against the Semi-Arians of Seleucia by the Acacians; and when the Seleucian deputies arrived at Constantinople, they had speedy proof of the difficulties of their situation. They complained to the Emperor of the heresy and misconduct of Eudoxius. Constantius interrupted: "Let us first get the doctrinal question settled." Basil boldly remonstrated with the Emperor for having drifted away from "orthodoxy." Constantius reproached him for causing disturbance in the churches, and ordered him to be silent. Eustathius was more successful than Basil in gaining the Emperor's attention, and produced a doctrinal paper recently promulgated by Eudoxius. The Emperor, who was by no means as yet prepared for Anomœanism, was shocked at the language of this document, which inferred the Anomoion from the text, "the Father, of whom are all things, and Jesus Christ, through whom are all things." He asked Eudoxius what he had to say. "The paper," said the bishop of Antioch, "is not mine: Aetius wrote it." Aetius, when summoned, avowed that it was his; he knew nothing of what had passed, did not understand what was involved in the question put to him, and even expected to gain credit by the avowal. A sentence of exile was there and then recorded against him, though not then executed; he was also "thrust out of the palace." Eustathius pushed the advantage he had won: "Eudoxius thinks exactly with Aetius: he has admitted him to his house and his table; he could not have been ignorant of the composition of this paper; in fact, he avowed his knowledge of its authorship." "Conjectures and inferences are not evidence," said the Emperor, for once showing a judicial mind. "Then," said Eustathius, "let Eudoxius condemn Aetius's paper, and he will convince us of his innocence." Eudoxius was commanded to do so; he "tried various evasions," but, with his usual timidity, shrank from threats of banishment, and pronounced a formal repudiation of Anomœanism, but demanded that his opponents should on their side renounce the unscriptural Homoiousion. Upon this, Silvanus boldly defended that phrase, as implied in the uncreatedness of the Son; and he was, in consequence, sentenced to exile. Here, then, was the Emperor in a position which apparently suited his temper well: he had rebuked, as he would think, the two extremes of Semi-Arian dogmatism and Anomœan profaneness, and had balanced himself in a *juste milieu*.

He resumed consideration of the case of Aetius, and put it into the hands of Honoratus, newly appointed as "city-prefect" of Constantinople; but soon resolved to examine Aetius personally. A discussion followed between Aetius and Basil, who was apparently attended by his namesake, afterwards the great St. Basil, who was not as yet in holy orders. Aetius was held to be vanquished, and the Emperor was, anew, disgusted with Ultra-Arianism. At this time, the final deputation from the Ariminian Council, bringing the Homœan creed as now accepted, arrived at Constantinople. They were immediately exhorted by the Seleucian delegates to hold no communication with the virtual patrons of Anomœanism. To the letter containing this counsel was annexed a copy of the impious statements which had been brought home to Aetius. But the deputies from Ariminum repelled this overture with scorn and anger, and hastened to unite with the Acacians, to proclaim the real purport of their anathema about the relation of the Son to "other creatures," and even to put a grossly sophistical sense on the propositions as to His being co-eternal, and not being produced from non-existing substance,—beside exhibiting their wonderful capacity for quibbling in regard to the Homoion itself, which was made to mean nothing inconsistent with the Anomoion; for, "according to the Scriptures," man is described as "like" to God, and a grain of mustard-seed to the kingdom of heaven: but we may imagine the indignation of the Semi-Arian delegates when urged by the triumphant Acacians to sign the Ariminian Creed. They protested that they could not give up the word "ousia." But when the Acacians declared "upon oath" that they did not hold the Anomoion, and indeed were ready to condemn it,—and when Constantius argued that whatever the Homoiousion implied would be better expressed by the simple Homoion, and menaced the unwilling Semi-Arians within the palace with exile in case of their refusal to adopt a formula which proscribed all but "Scriptural terms,"—at last, after a conference with the Emperor and the Acacians, which lasted through the whole of the 31st December, far on into the last night of the year 359 (for Constantius wanted to devote January 1 to the opening of his Consulship), the ten Seleucians consented, says Sulpicius, under this "imperial coercion," to adopt the unsound Western Creed.

One more Council was now held, before the gathering of bishops at Constantinople broke up. In the beginning of January, 360, the addition of the Bithynian prelates raised the number to

about fifty, and the new Synod included one memorable person, Ulphilas "the Goth," otherwise Urphilas, who had been born in 311 among the Goths north of the Danube, and sent as their envoy to Constantine. He had acted as a reader among his countrymen within the empire: in 341 he was consecrated by Eusebius of Nicomedia and other prelates, as bishop for the Goths, for whose instruction he laboured assiduously, translating all the Scriptures into his people's language with the exception of the four books of Kings, which he thought might increase their already excessive love of war. A persecution by the Gothic ruler drove him with his converts into Mœsia about 348. Philostorgius would represent him as the first bishop of the Goths, but he was certainly preceded by Theophilus, who sat in the Nicene Council; and although he was long supposed to have been intentionally Catholic, it is now clear, from a narrative by his pupil, an Arian bishop, which was discovered in the library of the Louvre, that he was from the first in some sense an Arian, and that his Arianism, when formulated, was of the Homœan type. The Council was ruled by the arch-Homœan Acacius; and its acts fall naturally into three divisions. First, it ratified the Ariminian creed, and abolished all preceding formulas. Even some who really held Ultra-Arian opinions adopted the Homoion as this set forth, and put their own sense upon it. The second business was the condemnation of Aetius, who, as before, was sacrificed by the Acacians. He was deposed from the diaconate, and banished by the Emperor into Cilicia. His writings were put under prohibition; and some bishops, who declined to sign the sentence (although, indeed, one of them, Serras, a Libyan, had borne testimony to the profane arrogance of Aetius), were excommunicated prospectively, if they did not submit within six months. But we are told by Sozomen that among those who did condemn him were some who avowed that they did so with reluctance, and only by way of disclaiming Anomœanism. The third business was one in which all Acacians would unite with genuine satisfaction; the Semi-Arian leaders, so lately, as it seemed, successful, were now prostrate, and were deposed on various grounds, affecting their conduct rather than their belief. Thus, Basil was accused of violent and tyrannical conduct towards certain clergy, of interference with the Emperor's officers in regard to the case of Aetius, of stirring up the Sirmian clergy against their bishop, of denouncing Valens and other bishops, of perjury in denying this act, of exciting sedition in the West, of ordaining a notorious

profligate, of evading accusations by making his clergy swear around the holy table not to accuse each other, of not excommunicating a "church-officer guilty of bloodshed." Eustathius was charged with various offences, for which he was said to have been already more than once put under censure. Eleusius was deprived for having, among other acts, ordained an ex-priest of Hercules, convicted of sorcery, and feigning to be a convert to Christianity. Cyril, whom the Acacians specially hated, was of course again deposed: he had already been vilified before Constantius for selling a rich vestment given by Constantine to his predecessor; that this sale was meant (as we have seen) to relieve the poor of Jerusalem during a famine, was deemed no excuse in the eyes of Arian formalists and courtiers. At a distinct session of the Council, Sophronius was deposed for avariciously selling, with a view to his own profit, the offerings made to his church, and of appealing to another court against the sentence of the synod; Silvanus, for making himself a party leader, and placing an unfit person in a bishopric; Neon, bishop of Seleucia, for having conferred the episcopate on men who were engaged in secular magistracies, and ignorant of Scripture and Church-rules. Macedonius was, of course, obnoxious to the Emperor for having previously provoked a sanguinary tumult, and he was also charged with laxity in discipline. To the sees of these prelates, Acacians or crypto-Anomœans were appointed, as Eudoxius to Constantinople: this unprincipled man signalised his first ministration in the newly completed cathedral of St. Sophia by a horrible and long-remembered jest about the Father being "impious" and the Son "pious," by way of enforcing the notion that the Son worshipped the Father. This was on Tuesday, February 15, 360. Here is one more illustration of the practical affinity of Acacianism to Anomœanism, which may represent the real outcome of that plausible modification of the heresy; while the confusion produced by what Socrates calls the "labyrinth" of Arian creeds may be best described by the heathen Ammianus's brief and bitter taunt at the "troops of prelates hurrying in public conveyances from one synod, as they call it, to another," or by the Catholic Hilary's famous words in his "second book to Constantius," presented during the sessions of this Council, in which he complains that now "there are as many creeds as fancies, that men wander about as various winds of doctrine sway them, that creeds are framed every year or every month, then cancelled, then renewed, until the most absolute perplexity and suicidal inconsistency had

become the normal state of Christian theologians." A passage which Gibbon calls worthy of a Christian philosopher, and which is sometimes read or quoted without due remembrance of the fact that, in Hilary's view, as in that of Athanasius, all this deplorable and scandalous uncertainty was the product of a restless heresy that was consistent in nothing but in aversion to the Nicene faith. Hilary, in this tract, requested leave to address the Emperor and the Council on the matters of doctrine involved in the Arian controversy: professing at the same time his own immovable fidelity to the creed of his regeneration, an older and simpler formula than the Nicene, but, as he believed, in entire accordance with it. The request was refused: he thereupon relieved his mind by composing, but taking care not to publish, an unmeasured invective "Against Constantius," and was afterwards sent back into Gaul, as "a sower of discord and a disturber of the East." And here we may close our review of that triumph which had been achieved by the persistency and diplomacy of Acacian Arianism.

CHAPTER XV.

RESULTS OF THE COUNCIL OF ARIMINUM.

THE cause of apostolic Christianity, as it had been vindicated and guarded in the Nicene Council, might, to human judgment, have seemed well-nigh a lost cause at the opening of the year 360. A great Western Council, whose proceedings had begun with an exhibition of unmistakable fidelity to the Nicene faith, had been partly wearied, partly menaced, partly beguiled into the acceptance, not of Semi-Arianism, but of that Acacian form of Arianism which, as managed by shifty and worldly-minded prelates, was effectively working in the interests of an extreme development of heresy, even although its representatives might find it convenient to disown and condemn the latter, and to put forward their Homoion as avoiding alike the technicality of the Homoiousion and the coarse impiety of the Anomoion—as embodying in a simple and "Scriptural" formula whatever was really necessary for saving faith in the Son of God. And the Semi-Arian Council of Seleucia, which had included several who were rather verbally than really separate from the orthodox position, had apparently witnessed in vain against the lower grades of Arianism, and had been followed by the submission of its representatives to that same Homœan formula which had secured the assent of the Westerns at Ariminum. It mattered little, comparatively, that the avowed upholder of the Anomoion, Aetius, whom zealous Churchmen called "the Godless," had been made a scapegoat for the Acacians, or even that the Anomoion had been in express terms repudiated by the less candid but not less profane Eudoxius. All who could really discern the true bearings of the case would feel that the proscription not only of the Catholic, but of the Semi-Arian creed, and the enforcement of the Homoion by a Council in the imperial city, and by the full weight of the imperial power, meant nothing else than the ultimate,

and probably the not distant triumph of Ultra-Arianism; unless, in the providence of God, some turn of events should deprive Arianism of the support of the State, or some vigorous reaction provoked by the Acacians' insolent triumph should neutralise the effect of the events at Ariminum, and impel the best of the Semi-Arians to take some further steps in the direction of Catholicity.

The "fearful troubles," as Tillemont expresses it, "which were excited in the Church by the exaction of signatures" to the Ariminian Creed, involved a persecution which Sozomen does not hesitate to call more grievous than those of the pagan emperors, inasmuch as, "if it seemed more moderate in regard to bodily inflictions, it entailed more disgrace to the Christian name, for both the persecutors and the persecuted were originally members of the Church," and fellow-Christians were treated as no Christian ought to treat any fellow-man. Jerome's famous hyperbole has already been quoted; in another passage he says that nearly all Churches were polluted by communion with Arians, under the pretext of "peace" and "the Emperor's will." Gregory of Nazianzus, who knew well what he was writing about, describes the expulsion of several bishops who refused to sign the new creed, and the substitution of others who accepted the episcopate on these terms. "The ink was ready, the informer was at hand;" many prelates subscribed against their own privately retained convictions, under pressure of menaces or under the influence of smooth persuasions. Some, says Gregory, had whatever excuse ignorance could furnish; but that, in the eye of Roman law, would be held no excuse at all. And the flocks, in many cases, followed blindly as their pastors went, accepting mechanically what they accepted: it was not so in other cases, as when Dianius of Cappadocian Cæsarea signed the creed, and Basil and "many others," who in his native country "feared the Lord," were exceedingly shocked and grieved at such compliance, and could not be satisfied until they were assured that the signature was given "in simplicity of heart," and "without any intention to abandon the faith of Nicæa." Gregory Nazianzen's father, the old bishop of Nazianzus, was, as his son expresses it, "carried away by his simplicity" to subscribe the Arianizing symbol, but was believed, at the time, to have not "defiled his soul with the ink" of the signature, but preserved his faith intact. The "more zealous Churchmen" of the city, while protesting against his act, admitted that it was a mistake, and not an apostasy.

Jerome describes the confusion which filled the Church, and the varying lines of action adopted by various bishops after the real bearing of the Ariminian catastrophe became apparent. "Some confined themselves to the communion of their own local church; some began to write to those who were in exile for their adherence to Athanasius; some, despairing of anything better, deplored the communion which they had adopted; a few—as men will do—defended their mistake as if it were a deliberate action." Lucifer, from his place of exile, began to pour forth pamphlet after pamphlet in denunciation of the injustice and tyranny of an Emperor who had, in his view, apostatized from the faith to Arianism; and it must be said that the volcanic fury of these outbursts was neither helpful nor honourable to the cause which had fired this zeal. He never thinks of measuring his words, of the responsibility attaching to sheer vehemence; he never stops to ask whether this or that phrase befits a Christian confessor. The title of one of his treatises is sufficiently significant—"One must not spare those who offend against God;" and his notion of "not sparing" is illustrated by one sentence: "God calls you (Constantius) a scorpion; are you angry with me for calling you so?" In another of these diatribes he says, "We think you as bad as worshippers of all the demons." Gregory, bishop of Elvira, wrote vigorously in behalf of the Nicene faith, and received a letter of congratulation from Eusebius of Vercellæ. "As long as you persevere in the same confession, and hold no intercourse with the hypocrites, promise yourself our communion. . . . All the hope of the Arian fanatics depends on the protection of secular sovereignty; they know not the text, 'Cursed are they that put their trust in man!'" Liberius himself, and Vincent of Capua, effaced, as Tillemont expresses it, the disgrace of their previous weakness by "refusing to consent to the decrees of Ariminum." In Gaul, the Council of Paris (the first of a series of synods held in that city, which was now associated with the court of the Cæsar Julian, who afterwards as Emperor looked back fondly to "his dear Lutetia") addressed to the Eastern bishops—that is, to those who had been represented at Seleucia, and had upheld the use of the term Ousia against the Acacian and crypto-Anomœan intriguers—a letter preserved among the "Fragments" of St. Hilary. From this letter it appears that the Seleucians had written to Hilary, denouncing those intriguers, and narrating the failure of their own attempt to keep the Ariminian delegates from

consenting to Arian "blasphemy." Hilary, who had now returned to Gaul, had evidently set before his brethren the true state of the case; they found that "their simplicity had been deceived into an abandonment of the word Ousia," according to the terms of the Ariminian formulary: they accordingly, in this Council, explicitly confessed the Homoousion itself, as the true expression of the actual "birth of the Only-begotten *God*" (as in one reading of John i. 18) "from God the Father;" defining the relation of the Son to the Father as not a "union" in the Sabellian sense, but a "unity" in the Catholic; identifying "ousia" with their own Latin "substantia;" condemning all the Anomœan "blasphemies," of which the Easterns had sent a list; announcing that they regarded as excommunicate Ursacius and Valens, and the other Ariminian delegates, together with Saturninus, and with those "apostate bishops" who, "by the ignorance or impiety of certain persons, had been set in the place of brethren undeservedly exiled; and promising and declaring in the presence of God, that whosoever should resist the decisions of the Council within Gaul should be expelled from the communion and from sacerdotal dignity." This Council of Paris was one of the first signs of hope, of a possible restoration of orthodoxy and unity, among the distressed and bewildered Churches of the West.

Nor were the Catholics of the East without some grounds of encouragement at the close of 360 and the beginning of 361. Anomœanism, to do its representatives justice, was usually associated with a downright frankness which makes them, comparatively, objects of respect, in contrast with the shifty insincerities of several less notorious Arians. But according to a story told by Theodoret, Eunomius, their ablest man, had been placed by Eudoxius in the see of Cyzicus, on the understanding, or rather with the hope, that he would not shock the ears of his flock by calling the Son of God a creature. "Eleusius has accustomed them to regard him as uncreate; you must not, by hasty and premature disclosure of your own sentiments, alienate those whom a little patience will bring round; when the right time comes, you can proclaim what, for the present, a prudent reserve must keep in the background." Eunomius, at first, adopted this advice, and used ambiguous language, which some of his orthodox hearers well understood to be a disguise for Anomœanism. Thereupon, meeting craft by craft, they went to the new bishop's house; and, as if zealous for definite teaching, begged him to speak out, and save the flock

from theological uncertainties. What was his real belief? Eunomius fell, it is said, into the snare, and expressed his belief in the Anomoion. "It will be very unjust and irreligious in you," they rejoined, "not to make this truth, which you thus hold, public before all men." He followed this insidious counsel; and they, hurrying to Constantinople, denounced him as an Anomœan before Eudoxius, and then, when he paid no attention to their complaint, before Constantius, who, being still hostile to Anomœanism, ordered Eudoxius to send for Eunomius, and try him on the charge of heresy. Eudoxius tried to gain time. On this, the accusers again complained to the Emperor, who menaced Eudoxius with banishment if he any longer neglected to obey; and Eudoxius was constrained to send a formal citation to Eunomius, but at the same time privately warned him to leave Cyzicus, and to take all the blame to himself for having transgressed the counsel given to him: whereupon Eunomius retired from Cyzicus, imputed treachery to Eudoxius, and proceeded to form a sect of his own, on the basis, of course, of explicit Anomœanism. This is Theodoret's account, worth remembering as an illustration of the laxity of Greek Christians in regard to "pious frauds;" but a simpler and likelier story is told by Socrates and Sozomen, although with too late a date—that Eunomius at first made a great impression on the people of Cyzicus by his parade of dialectical ability, but after a while, and as associated with Arianizing language, it disgusted them so much that they drove him out of their city, and he took up his abode at Constantinople, as an "unemployed bishop." Thereupon the Cyzicene clergy accused him of innovating in doctrine; Eudoxius obliged him to make a public statement of his theological tenets, and thereupon, acquitting him of all blame, sent him back to Cyzicus; but he declared that he would not remain any longer with persons who had suspected him, and took this opportunity of seceding from the communion of the established Arianizing sect—a step to which, in fact, he was prompted by his indignation at the harsh treatment experienced by Aetius, whom he habitually spoke of as his master. Philostorgius agrees with other accounts in regard to the accusation of Eunomius by members of the Cyzicene church, and then says that Eudoxius summoned him to Constantinople; that he, at first, reproached Eudoxius with neglecting to fulfil his promise of bringing back Aetius from exile; that he then defended himself before the Constantinopolitan clergy, and professed his acceptance of the Homoion, or "Like according

to the Scriptures," and his rejection of the Anomoion, as well as of the Homoiousion: whereupon Eudoxius exultingly quoted the words, "Mine answer to them that do examine me is this," and requested Eunomius to preach on the festival of the Epiphany. The sermon, it is added, asserted the absolute "subservience" of the Son to the Father, which would at least imply Anomœanism; and then Eudoxius, after highly eulogizing Eunomius, was so far from fulfilling the promise about Aetius, that he tried to induce Eunomius to acquiesce in the deposition of Aetius, and sign the Ariminian creed. If, as Philostorgius had just before asserted, Eunomius had made profession of the Homœan faith, he could have no difficulty about the Ariminian decisions; but he would by no means sacrifice his friend and instructor, and refused to do either of the two things proposed to him. He then resigned the see of Cyzicus, and withdrew into his native Cappadocia; but, says Philostorgius, was recalled to stand his trial at Antioch, in consequence of the representations of Acacius to the Emperor. When the day of trial arrived, however, Acacius durst not act as accuser; and the case was adjourned for a larger Council. This long story of Philostorgius is in more than one particular inconsistent with itself; and the general facts would seem to be, that Eunomius was accused of Anomœanism, and that Eudoxius was compelled to sacrifice him as he had already thrown over Aetius; that Eunomius was thus deprived of his bishopric, and provoked to adopt the position of a seceder, the head of a sect representing unmitigated Arianism, and planting the Anomœan theory on a distinctly rationalistic basis. All mystery, as we have seen, was excluded by Eunomius from theology: God was represented as possessing no transcendent knowledge of His own nature, as in nowise superior to man in regard to the comprehension of Himself. In short, human thought *could* be an adequate measure of the Divine mind and being; and Eunomius made the enormous assumption that this intellectual comprehension was the "knowledge of God" presupposed in Scripture. At first one asks, Could a Theist seriously hold this? The explanation seems to be, that the simplifying process which had got rid of Trinitarian distinctions, and reduced God, as Dorner says, to "an individual shut up in Himself," found its *nemesis* in this "cool and irreligious assertion." And what was his Christology? According to his words as quoted by St. Basil, and to the formal exposition of his belief which years afterwards he presented to Theodosius I.,

there was but one Person in the Godhead, single, solitary, peerless, having no companion in Deity, no partner in authority, no assessor in majesty (language which reminds us of Mohammedan negations): yet under this one only true God there was a "God only-begotten," but begotten in such sort as not to have existed from eternity—one who could be entitled a "true God,"—"like" to the Father in the sense of being His image and seal, a "Lord" and "King of glory," but not actually partaker of the dignity of the "Father." Here we find even an ultra-Arian theologian employing the "glorious and awful Name" in the unreal sense which the pagan element in Arianism had made popular. The Holy Spirit was spoken of as made by, and holding an inferior position to, the Son; yet both Son and Spirit, as created, must have been regarded as on the same level before the solitary incommunicable majesty of the one true Almighty God. The Eunomian sect, we may here observe, expressed its intense hostility to every other form of belief by rebaptizing those who had been baptized into the Name of the Trinity, and by practising a single immersion "into the name" or "the death" of Christ.

The scandal caused by the exposure of Eunomius would, in one respect, tell favourably on the interests of orthodox belief. Another phenomenon would probably cause many who held, or who inclined towards, that belief, to realise more distinctly the tendency of all Arian schools to various developments of heresy, or, as Sozomen expresses it, "the progress of doctrinal innovation towards yet further novelties of opinion." For the "Macedonian" theory, as it was called after the Semi-Arian Macedonius of Constantinople—which spoke of the Spirit as the proper Arians had spoken of the Son, *i.e.* which described Him as a created being, the servant and minister of the Son—appears to have been forming itself at this time, and attracted the attention of Athanasius in his retreat, for he wrote against it in his Letters to Serapion. If in one respect it illustrated a "down-grade" movement, in another it might be taken to show that many, at least, of those who held it were now ready to magnify the Son as practically co-equal to the Father, and to reserve the conception of essential inferiority for the Spirit, who, of course, had all along been held by Arians and Arianizers to be unequal to the Father; and these Semi-Arians might some day come to acknowledge the Divinity of the Holy Spirit, if, as was hoped, they were now virtually persuaded of the proper Divinity of the Son. On the other hand, of course, it could not be without

anxiety and distress that Catholics would view the uprising of this new theory; for not a few minds might rest in it, and concentrate on the question of the Holy Spirit, by help of this new formula, the remnants of Arian thought which otherwise might have gradually, perhaps rapidly, dissolved, and vanished from their mental area. And thus the formation of Macedonianism was for the time a manifest evil, although hopeful minds might regard it as, to some extent, a symptom of the decline of the Arian heresy.

The beginning of 361 was signalised by a remarkable event, which greatly affected the condition of the orthodox of Antioch, and which illustrated the upward tendencies of some good men who had been connected with Arianizing schools. The great see of Antioch was filled up by the action of a Council in which, according to Epiphanius, the Acacians were pre-eminent, and which appointed Meletius to the bishopric. This celebrated man, famous during many subsequent years not only for the conspicuous and unique position which he occupied, but for the mental gifts and the moral beauty of character which endeared him to so many churches, even although he lacked the recognition of the two sees which ranked first and second in the hierarchy, had been made bishop of Sebaste in Armenia, the see vacated by the deposition of the Semi-Arian Eustathius; but as Eustathius was deposed twice, at Melitene about 356, and at Constantinople by the triumphant Acacians in 360, it is difficult to say at what time Meletius was set in his place. At any rate, he found his position unendurable on account of the "contumacy" of his people, who were strongly attached to Eustathius; he therefore resigned the see, and withdrew to Berœa in Syria, where, according to Socrates, he acted as bishop, and from whence he repaired to the Seleucian Council, and there subscribed the creed drawn up by Acacius. He would thus be supposed to agree with the dominant form of Arianism:—such is Theodoret's statement, by way of accounting for his promotion to the Antiochene see, so far as the Acacians were concerned; and it is necessary, for the understanding of after-events, to bear always in mind that Meletius's antecedents were, in the Homœan sense, Arian. But, Theodoret adds, "the adherents of apostolical doctrine, knowing Meletius to be sound in the faith, and being clearly aware of the splendour of his character and the richness of his virtue, gave their assent to this election, and actively promoted the framing and the general subscription of the decree for carrying it out. Both parties," he asserts, "entrusted

this decree to the keeping of Eusebius, bishop of Samosata," who had begun his career in relations with Arianism, but soon took up a Catholic position. This story exaggerates the action which Catholics would be in a position to take in such a matter; and Theodoret writes with a very strong bias in favour of Meletius, who was thus brought to Antioch, and received by a vast procession, including not only bishops, clergy, and laity, but even Jews and Greeks. The greatest curiosity was felt as to the line of teaching which he would follow. Even the "Eustathians" or Old Churchmen, who were, as we have seen, in Athanasius's eyes the true Church of Antioch, and who, in default of a bishop, acknowledged the priest Paulinus as their head, were nearly as much interested in the question as those who adhered to the communion of the Antiochene episcopate; and among these latter were these orthodox who were represented by Flavian and Diodore, and the Arians who were anxious that the theology of Eudoxius should not be dislodged from so important a stronghold. Truly the scene in the Golden Church must have been striking and dramatic, when, after some sermons of a purely practical character, Meletius was called upon to take part in a course of addresses on the great text (Prov. viii. 22) which, in its Septuagint rendering, had been for years a battle-field between Catholics and Arians: "The Lord created me a beginning of His ways, for His works." For the most part, all disputants agreed in regarding the Septuagint as practically infallible; and it was this habitual assumption which made it so needful that a Jerome should arise to assert the claims of the "Hebrew verity." Here and there a scholarly writer, such as Dionysius of Rome or Eusebius of Cæsarea, might suggest that "appointed" rather than "created" would give the true import of the original, and might thus prepare the way for Basil's yet bolder observation that "other translators had come nearer to the sense of the Hebrew by rendering it 'possessed.'" But few had ventured to hint that "Wisdom," in a Hebrew poem, might be a Divine attribute personified; and Athanasius had taken what to us seems very needless trouble by arguing at great length that the text referred to the creation of our Lord's human body, while on the other hand the Arians confidently adduced it as decisive against the eternity or uncreatedness of the Word or Son; and on this occasion Constantius evidently intended a triumph for his form of Arianism, when he ordered that the different bishops now assembled in Antioch should deliver

addresses, not extempore, but carefully prepared and written, by way of exposition of the passage. George of Laodicea, who had returned from Semi-Arianism to the older and more pronounced Arianism, "displayed" in his paper "the full offensiveness of the heresy." Acacius followed, in a discourse which was "far removed" from proper Arianism, but which did not come up to the standard of orthodoxy. Then Meletius stood up. His sermon, preserved by Epiphanius, begins with the subject of peace and charity: it describes the Son not only as God from God, but as the ineffable exponent of the Ineffable, the personal Word, the Offspring of the Father and "exactly representing His impress;" it explains the text as giving a particular illustration of that mysterious Filiation which no one phrase could set forth. Although the Homoousion was not asserted, and Catholics might, like Epiphanius, object to "two or three points" in the discourse, the speaker would be considered as having abandoned the Arian position, or, in Newman's lively phrase, to have "confessed the true Catholic tenet, so long exiled from the throne and altars of Antioch." The orthodox among his hearers broke forth, after the fashion of the age, into shouts of applause; and on the other hand, according to Sozomen, the Arian archdeacon stopped the new patriarch's mouth with his hand, whereupon Meletius significantly extended three fingers towards the people, and then only one finger; when the archdeacon released his mouth in order to seize his hand, Meletius took the opportunity of proclaiming the Nicene faith, and exhorting his people to adhere to it unreservedly. A graphic but improbable anecdote; Theodoret more credibly says that the extension of the fingers was in reply to a request from the congregation that Meletius would give a short summary of his belief; and Meletius, it is added, accompanied these gestures with the terse antithetical sentence, "We conceive of Three, but we address One." The orthodox, including the Eustathians, were transported with delight: the Arian countenances were overspread with sullen gloom. The party could not, of course, tolerate such a demonstration on the part of the new patriarch: within thirty days he was removed from the city, in pursuance of a resolution of the Arian bishops and of an order from Constantius. The governor who was charged with the execution of this decree was pelted by the crowd as he passed with Meletius through the great square of the city; but according to the tale received by Chrysostom, Meletius spread his own cloak over him, giving thereby a lesson of patience to

his new flock. It is said the deed of his election was demanded back from Eusebius of Samosata; that he stretched out both his hands, saying, "Rather cut off my hands than bid me resign a trust!" and that Constantius could not help admiring so manly a spirit, and held Eusebius thenceforth in high estimation. But he placed in the see of Antioch one of the oldest and most notorious of Arian partisans, Euzoius, once deposed from the diaconate by Alexander of Alexandria for adhering to the heresiarch, with whom in fact he had been on intimate terms. This was too much for those orthodox Antiochenes who had hitherto conformed to the established Church. They determined to renounce all communion with the new bishop: they could not coalesce with Paulinus and the Eustathians, because the latter did not recognise Meletius on the ground of his Arian consecration; but they held their services in a church called "the Apostles'," which stood outside the "old city" on the bank of the Orontes. Euzoius did himself credit by permitting the Eustathians to meet in a small church, within the "new city" which had been built between the branches of the river by Seleucus II. and Antiochus III. This concession was a tribute to the gentle disposition and the high character of their presbyter Paulinus. The two orthodox bodies, united by faith but not in outward communion, must have witnessed with horror and indignation the open avowal of Anomœanism by a Council held under the auspices of Euzoius, which promulgated another Arian creed—the last and the worst in a catalogue which includes some twenty formularies, beginning with Arius's letter to Alexander. It plainly called the Son a creature made out of nothing; it bluntly asserted Him to be "in no wise like to the Father." The authors of this document were, however, asked how they could reconcile such language with the appellation, "God of God," which their creed still gave to the Son? They fell back on the despicable and odious quibble originally invented by George of Laodicea, that all things—all creatures—may be said to be "from God." But the equivocation was too gross: "they could not," says Socrates, "endure the reproaches and the condemnation which they incurred;" and they accordingly laid aside this Anomœan symbol, and reaffirmed the Ariminian creed which had been sanctioned at Constantinople. So stood the Arian cause in the early months of 361.

CHAPTER XVI.

JULIAN.

The year 361 was marked by a sudden and tragical revolution in the relations of the Christian faith to the Roman empire. The minds of Christians, whether orthodox or heterodox, had for many years past been familiarised with that combination which Tertullian had regarded as practically beyond all hope—the combination of imperial sovereignty with the profession of the service of the Crucified. Constantine might be but an inconsistent and unsatisfactory proselyte, but he had with ever-increasing emphasis delighted to proclaim himself the worshipper and the instrument of the one true God revealed in Christ; and Constantius, perverse and tyrannous as he was, notoriously addicted to a particular form of Arian Christianity, and relentless in his oppression of the Catholic leaders, had made himself conspicuous as even pedantically attached to what Newman calls an "imperceptible centre" between the Homoousian faith and the coarser developments of heresy, and afterwards as acquiescing in the Homœan indefiniteness. But now, while Christians of antagonistic communions were absorbed in their own controversies, and contending, as it were, for the future of the Roman world—while Catholics of a fervid and impetuous disposition were regarding the Emperor as an Antichrist because he persecuted them in the interests of his own unsound theology, and while his old Semi-Arian friends were disgusted by his deviation into the path of Acacianism, and anticipated, perhaps, his ultimate acceptance of Anomœanism—all classes of his Christian subjects were startled by the unexpected thunderpeal of tidings which made it too certain that the throne of the empire would ere long be filled by a prince who had openly renounced the Christian name. It is not without a thrill of awe, assuredly not without a fixed gaze of absorbed attention, that

Christian students, after the lapse of so many Christian ages, can contemplate such a phenomenon as the brief career of the Emperor Julian, surnamed the Apostate.

Already had this unhappy man gone through vicissitudes sufficient to make a longer life eventful. He was the first cousin of Constantius, being the son of Constantine's half-brother Julius Constantius, and of Basilina, a daughter of the noble Anician house, and undoubtedly a Christian. Julian, the only child of this marriage, called after his grandfather, a prætorian prefect, was born at Constantinople in 331, apparently on the 6th of November, and appears to have been baptized as a child, and sedulously surrounded with Christian influences from the first dawn of memory and thought. Then came the hideous massacre of nine princes of the younger branch of the house (as Julian's enumeration literally implies), which signalised the accession of Constantius, but for which he can hardly be held responsible. Julian was at this time in his seventh year; he afterwards asserted that Constantius had at first intended that he and his elder half-brother Gallus (born in 325) should share the fate of the other victims, but that ultimately their lives were spared in order to be spent in a kind of exile. The motives for this change of intention, or, at any rate, for the extension of mercy to the two boys, are given by Socrates, who says that Julian was spared because he was so young, and Gallus because he was supposed to be sinking under a disease; but Gregory Nazianzen, who, in spite of his tendency to declamation, probably possessed some trustworthy information on these matters, describes Julian as privately saved from the hands of the destroyers of his kindred by the good offices of Mark, bishop of Arethusa. Whatever may have been the case as to this crisis of Julian's life, it seems clear that he was left in entire dependence on the good pleasure of Constantius; as he himself said, he had inherited no property from his father, whose estates were naturally confiscated to the crown. Constantius appears to have sent him, for a time, to Nicomedia, to be there educated by Eusebius the bishop; and we read of his having been trained in grave and self-restrained habits by a Scythian eunuch named Mardonius, who acted as his "pedagogue," or guardian attendant, while he lived in Constantinople, and taught him (no bad lessons) to love the Odyssey, and to admire both Aristotle and Plato. He was probably about thirteen when Constantius assigned for his abode, and that of Gallus, an imperial castle named Macellum in the distant woodlands

of Cappadocia. It is curious to see the different representations made by himself and by Gregory concerning the six years which the brothers spent in this place. Gregory descants on the benevolence of Constantius in preserving these remnants of the imperial house in a princely mansion, where they were carefully instructed in the whole curriculum of liberal education. Julian looks back with disgust to the enforced seclusion, where, as he expresses it, they were "debarred from all good learning," reduced to associate with their slaves, and assured, but not convinced, that the Emperor now regretted the massacre of their father and brother and other kindred. There is no doubt that great pains were taken to confirm the impression made by their early Christian teaching, but taken in a very unwise and wholly unhopeful fashion. They were taught Christianity by masters who accustomed them to a round of religious acts, specially to attendance at Church-service, and visits to the tombs of martyrs: we are told that they jointly reared a church in honour of St. Mamas of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, and Gregory sees a token of Divine displeasure against Julian in the circumstance that the part of the building which he had undertaken to construct repeatedly fell down. The youths also enrolled themselves, he tells us, in the order of readers, and officiated as such in the church; and to all appearance both were equally sincere in their professions of Christian zeal. This state of things lasted until about the middle of 350, when Julian obtained permission to resume his studies at Constantinople. He was now a youth of nineteen. Among his teachers was a "sophist" or professor named Hekebolius, at that time a Christian, or, at any rate, one who made some display of attachment to Arian Christianity; and Nicocles, a "grammarian" from Lacedæmon, also a Christian —for Constantius made a point of prohibiting his kinsmen from hearing any lectures given by persons of suspected belief. Early in 351 the Emperor's restless jealousy—requited by as constant distrust on Julian's part—removed him to Nicomedia; it would be thought desirable to give the prince as few opportunities as possible of becoming popular in the capital. But then Nicomedia itself was a place of danger to Julian's faith; Libanius was residing and lecturing there, and a promise was extorted from Julian not to attend the too celebrated professor. Julian kept his promise in the letter, but broke it in the spirit, by arranging with a ferryman—as Libanius asserts—for a large sum to convey to him notes of the lectures taken down by one of the students: these

notes he eagerly studied, no doubt with all the zest peculiar to "stolen waters," and without perceiving that rhetoric was sinking into a pedantry divorced, as Professor Dill says, from realities, and baneful to "intellectual progress." But it was the province of Asia which, as Gregory expresses it, "became for Julian a school of impiety:" for it was at Pergamum, whither he was permitted to travel with something of the state as well as of the liberty of a prince, that he had an interview with the aged Neo-Platonist Ædesius, who, like Porphyry and Iamblichus, and others of that school, united the fantasies of occult science with the Alexandrian mysticism, and whose disciple Eusebius whetted Julian's "sacrilegious curiosity," as Augustine calls it, by warning him against magic, and thus inspired him with an eagerness to visit and hear Maximus, an archimage, so to speak, of antichristian philosophy, who was then in high reputation at Ephesus. But we must now ask, What was there in Julian which impelled him to plunge into these recesses of pagan speculation, and ultimately to abandon Christianity in obedience, as it were, to the fascination which they exerted?

It is not, assuredly, enough to say that he was urged on by a passionate ambition to reign, and was therefore an apt pupil of pagan wizards who promised him the empire. Whatever effect any hopes or promises of this kind might have on a mind which must have been conscious of considerable aptitudes for sovereignty, we must look further and deeper for the determining causes of the change. They are connected with Julian's own special circumstances, with his peculiar experiences, with the drift of his temperament—in short, with his personality.

And first, his Christian training had been a drill; the belief and the duties of a Christian had been imposed upon him by instructors who never seem to have even attempted to appeal to his conscience or his heart, but had been content to put him through a mechanical routine, so that for him Christianity represented a series of tasks and restrictions. The process employed was essentially that which in ordinary life has so often produced a resentful submission, and collected materials for a later revolt. The mistake made by religious parents, who know not how to sympathize with their children, and who live to find that those children, as they grow up and attain a freedom which can no longer be withheld, simply "hate church-going," and throw off religion as an intolerable yoke, was committed in this historic case on a scale of such magnitude

that it affected the future of an empire; so that Julian never really assimilated the religion forced on him from without, and long before he had actually given up his acquiescence in Christian doctrine, he had lost all chance of taking hold of it by such a faith as could be in a true sense vital: it was turned into "the letter that killeth." And Dr. Rendall, in his monograph on Julian, makes the apt remark that as his religious training was "violently Arian," it could not in any case have prepared him to appreciate "Christ's character and work."

Secondly, the name of Christ had been unhappily bound up, for Julian, with that of Constantius. He had suffered from the jealous unfriendliness of his kinsman; he knew that that kinsman might at any moment be driven by fear and dislike to give very active expression to this more or less hostile mood. And Constantius posed as a zealous Christian monarch, even as a polemical champion of one particular form (so called) of Christian theology. How could the boy, or the growing youth, when brooding over his prospects in what he considered an imprisonment under the pretence of worthy nurture, help remembering in whose name his nearest relations had been slaughtered, and how that name was constantly associated with edicts in favour of Arian dogma? Council after Council met under imperial auspices; creed after creed received more or less of imperial sanction; the Emperor himself could argue like a divine in behalf of the formulary which for the moment suited his fancy, or commended itself to his preference; and whatever for the moment he approved was to be dutifully adopted by his subjects. Tyranny over minds was thus associated with all that was mean and repulsive in character, with ignoble methods of government, with a tribe of palace-favourites each more detestable and mischievous than the other, so that, in the pagan historian's scathing phrase, the imperial court was "a seminary of all the vices." Here was a representation of Christianity as enthroned which might well prove a rock of offence to a young mind which honestly scorned what was base or cruel; and we cannot but say with Milman that "the unchristian Christianity of Constantius must bear some part of the guilt of Julian's apostasy."

Thirdly, we must take account of his peculiarly "Hellenic" temperament, which found in the graceful mythology and legendary poetry of Greece a charm that made Christian doctrine seem dry and poor and cold and uninteresting. He had none of the solidity of the Latin genius; he was Greek in tastes and in feeling, had the

Greek vivacity and the Greek sensitiveness, was devoted to Greek literature, and, in Archbishop Trench's phrase, "could not consent to lose the grace and beauty of the Greek worship." His "eager delight in the wonderful products of Greek imagination and thought would be accompanied by impatient intolerance of the Christian anathemas against classical idolatry." They would seem to him to declare war against culture itself, to represent mere brutal obstructiveness, or a sullen dislike of all that could make life lovely. It is hard for us to realise the attractions of the old idolatry; but they certainly existed, and exercised a potent fascination. It is harder yet to understand a state of mind which was simply dead to all the moral and spiritual majesty of the Gospel faith; but many were then quite unable to appreciate it, or even to admit its claim on their consideration. We cannot ignore the multitudinous evidence of an astonishing tenacity of life displayed by paganism long after the Church had secured possession of the high places of the world, and reappearing not only in "philosophers," but in poets, historians, professors, physicians, generals, and statesmen high in office; and an ardent youth, with a rapturous enthusiasm for a brilliant literature and its artistic products, would naturally respond to the appeal made to a whole side of his nature by a system which had for ages enlisted in its service such a wealth of poetry and imaginative genius. And indeed we can understand him better, if we remember how the rediscovery of classical literature at the Renaissance "produced an intellectual intoxication" which seemed to lift Plato above St. Paul, and even above Christ.

Lastly, there was in him a vein of unhealthy mysticism, which could not find satisfaction in the grave, severe, and reserved supernaturalism wherein Christianity had embodied its answer to the soul's deepest questions, its provision for the soul's most urgent needs. No greater mistake was ever made than that of the eighteenth-century unbelievers (satirised by Berkeley in his "Alciphron") who claimed "the Apostate" as a freethinker. He was in his own way a devotee; he had a passion for the mysterious; he craved for heights and depths; but the heights and depths of the Gospel were not such as he could appreciate; they did not satisfy a morbid curiosity, nor minister to a superstition which St. Paul would have called "carnal," but which illustrated the young prince's strange lack of good sense, and also of healthy humour. They were silent on matters as to which he was impatient for knowledge, and also demanded a mental humiliation

against which his vanity instinctively rebelled. Thus he was attracted to the weird sensational theurgy by which at that time, under the guidance of Iamblichus, Neo-Platonism had been vulgarised: he actually submitted to the ghastly blood-bath of the Taurobolia by way of undoing his early baptism; he fancied that the new lore could give an esoteric interpretation to the popular mythology, could surround it with the charm of fantastic rites, and promote his scheme of an idealization of the current Hellenism,—the title of "King Helios" being assigned to an invisible solar deity, acting downward upon a sphere of "intellectual" creatures, between the "intelligible" or "transcendental" and the "sensuous," cosmic, or visible spheres, and regarded as the agent of the one archetypal principle of existence, which ranked first in the Neo-Platonic triad as "the One" (Thing), a sublime abstraction transcending all "qualities," but which Julian strove to invest with character by entitling it "the Good." It would seem that this Helios, who is clearly analogous to Mithra, was also to be a substitute for the Logos of Christianity; and Julian did not object to speaking of beneficent spirits as "solar angels." The Neo-Platonist theosophy was indeed at a disadvantage for want of a basis, and that want could not be supplied by mere assertions about divine communications received in ecstasy; nor could it be forced into union with that old cultus of "the Immortals" which Julian was bent on retaining, and which he thought he could refine by reading into it his own ideas, by spiritualising its materialistic imagery into "enigmatic adumbrations" of truth, and by elevating the ethical standard of those who officially represented it.

Such was, on the whole, the movement of his mind. It was afterwards remembered that in rhetorical discussions with his brother he had taken pleasure in maintaining the pagan side; and Gallus was ere long alarmed by reports which induced him first to send Aetius—of all persons—on a visit to Julian, in the hope of thus counteracting any pagan influences; and then, on receiving a reassurance from Aetius, he expresses his satisfaction in a letter to Julian, who had made himself an adept in dissimulation, and was ready for any amount of hypocritical conformity: he could read the Scriptures in church as a "lector," and secretly revel in his initiation into mysteries of which Maximus was the hierophant.

At the end of 354, a new change befell his external position. Gallus, a rough-tempered and incompetent person, had held the dignity of Cæsar, which in Diocletian's system had distinguished

an heir-apparent. But he had come into collision with the ever-suspicious Emperor, had been lured away from his eastern province, and beheaded, "against all laws," in a Dalmatian island. Julian, who says, "If he was not fit to reign, it was due to his rustic education, and he had at least a right to live," seemed likely to be involved in his brother's fate, and for seven months was practically a prisoner, "in the midst," says Libanius, "of fully armed guards, who looked at him with savage glances." The main part of that time he spent at Milan, where Constantius then resided; but the Emperor only once admitted him to an audience, and then in consequence of the kind offices of the Empress Eusebia. In the middle of 355, while the Arian persecution was beginning, Julian was permitted to visit Athens, where he spent some time in study; and it was during this period that he paid a secret visit to the mysterious sanctuary of Eleusis. His sojourn at the great Hellenic school, or, in a lax sense of the term, University, was naturally a time of vivid enjoyment; he was regarded as able to teach rather than to learn; a crowd of ardent Greek students gathered round him, and were delighted "to hear the language of poets and schools, the native idiom of the Attic soil, uttered with grace and dignity by princely lips." Gregory of Nazianzus, and Basil, afterwards "the Great," were among his Christian fellow-students: Julian had met Basil at Constantinople in former years, and now, more than once, visited the two friends in their common lodging. There was much ground for intellectual sympathy, many topics of conversation which would not touch on matters of belief; but the impression which Julian produced, at least on Gregory, was decidedly unfavourable. Gregory thought the prince eccentric and morbidly excitable: he was struck by the outward manifestations of an unbalanced and unhealthy mind; he noted, as significant of evil, the strange abruptness of Julian's talk, his jerky and unmeaning questions and replies, his wandering glances, his noisy laughter,—the supercilious sneers, and grotesque contortions of countenance, which corresponded with the frequent shrugging of his broad shoulders,—the general aspect of uneasiness, restlessness, disdain. "How great a mischief to itself is the empire fostering!" exclaimed Gregory; then added, "God send I may not prove a true prophet!" The nervous symptoms thus detailed might in part be due to Julian's perpetual anxiety to guard the secret of his paganism, in part to his perpetual alarms about his own safety, which culminated when, in the autumn of 355, he was again summoned to Milan, and had

no choice but to obey, although, as he himself says, with a flood of tears, and an agonized prayer for protection addressed with outstretched hands to the Athenian goddess. His alarms were soon dispelled: Constantius, acting under Eusebia's influence, was resolved to raise him to the dignity of Cæsar, and to place him in deputed sovereignty over Gaul and Germany, Spain and Britain. This step was taken on the 6th of November, 355; but it did not abate the prince's apprehensions, and he was still kept under strict surveillance—"the servants' hands were searched, lest they should convey to him a bit of a letter from a friend." However, the situation improved: a marriage was arranged between Julian and Helena, the sister of Constantius, who died five years later; and he set forth for his new government with only two confidential servants, both of whom, as it appears, were in his secret: they were Euhemerus, his librarian, and Oribasius, his physician and secret diviner. We are not concerned with his Gallic administration, except to observe that it brought into action some of his highest qualities, and materially prepared him for accepting the magnificent career to which the tumultuary enthusiasm of his troops at Paris invited him in the summer of 360. "Julian Augustus" did not immediately proclaim his devotion to the pagan cause: his last act of religious insincerity was a formal attendance, on the Epiphany of 361, at the Church service in the cathedral of Vienne; but as he hastened eastwards to confront the army of Constantius, he threw off all reserve, and publicly offered sacrifice to the gods. The expected collision was averted by the fatal illness of Constantius, who, soon after he had received baptism from the Ultra-Arian Euzoius at Antioch, was struck down by a violent attack of fever, and died at Mopsucrene under Mount Taurus, on the 3rd of November, 361.

Thus Julian, now avowedly "the Apostate," was left in undisputed possession of the empire. And in considering his reign in relation to the history of the Church, it will be convenient in the first instance to take a brief survey of his various proceedings towards the religion which he had now publicly abandoned, and then to notice the leading events internal to that community which signalised his brief but extraordinary reign.

He had taken care to combine a solemn recognition of the gods, whom he chose to regard as "protectors" of that New Rome which had been founded as a purely Christian capital, with his personal participation in the funeral solemnities of Constantius.

The new monarch, who, with due outward show of regret and reverence, touched the coffin of a predecessor and rival, but soon took vengeance on the base ministers of his tyranny, proceeded to inaugurate the restoration of pagan worship by pouring libations with his own hand, congratulating those who did the like, "laughing at those who declined to do so, endeavouring to persuade them to comply, but not choosing to put any force on their inclinations." This was the account given by his admired friend Libanius. He himself writes to Maximus, who had been the agent of his pagan initiation, that he has established public worship of the gods, with hecatombs in thanksgiving for his great success; and at a later time he informed the sophist Hekebolius that no "Galilæan" (his favourite term of disparagement for Christians) has been put under any pressure, or dragged to the temple, thanks to his humane and benevolent decrees. Theodoret angrily refers, more than once, to the epithets of "most gentle, most dispassionate," by which the pagan Emperor became known among a large circle of pagan sympathizers. And it is admitted by other Church historians that he expressly adopted toleration of all opinions as the watchword of his policy. Socrates, indeed, insists that, in a certain extended sense of the term, he must be described as a persecutor, but at the same time draws a clear line between him and the older pagan assailants of the Church. Sozomen more fairly and explicitly represents him as, at first at any rate, "having recourse to argument and persuasion, attempting to allure rather than coerce men into paganism, charging the people not to commit any injustice against the Christians, not to insult them, not to constrain them to offer sacrifice, and not even forbidding them to assemble for worship; and in this acting on the persuasion that what needs for its attainment the activity of the free will can never be achieved by the employment of force." It was possible, so argued the Emperor, as his views were represented by Libanius, to cure a bodily disease by a severe operation; but errors on the nature of God could not be eradicated by fire or steel; and to what purpose would the hand sacrifice, if the thought condemned the hand? This, as it has been truly said, was "a philosophy altogether new to Romans," whose formalism was content with an outward compliance. But there were, we may suppose, three strong reasons in Julian's own mind and experience, for his resolution to abstain from such severities. First of all, he was far from being naturally cruel: Ammianus tells us that he often "threatened" when

he would not "strike," and that in some cases he moderated penal inflictions even on personal enemies, "with a genuine lenity" such as would contrast attractively with the cruelties which timidity had made natural to Constantius. Secondly, his theology, so to say, disinclined him to avenge the quarrel of the gods by the sword: he objected to the very idea of a "jealous God," and was wont to regard his deities as tolerant of religious varieties. And thirdly, his early familiarity with narratives of martyrdom had left in his mind a rational conviction that the ancient persecutors had but stimulated the moral forces of the religion which they had endeavoured to stamp out; or, as we are told by Sozomen, whose candour is justly praised by Rendall, "he had found that the cruelties of former times had been of no avail for securing the position of Paganism,—that, on the contrary, they had been a principal cause of the increase of Christianity; and he believed that he should be better able to establish paganism by showing himself unexpectedly forbearing and gentle to the multitude of Christians." These maxims of toleration were embodied by Julian himself in a memorable letter, written at Antioch, nearly a year after his accession, to the people of Bostra in Arabia: "Do not you," he says, "who serve the gods, damage the houses of those who err through ignorance rather than of set purpose; we must persuade and instruct men by reason, not by stripes, or insults, or bodily inflictions. Therefore I again and repeatedly exhort those who are zealous for the true worship, to do no wrong to the multitude of the Galilæans" (*i.e.* Christians), "not to attack or insult them, but to pity rather than hate those who fare badly in the greatest of all matters." We must, of course, assume that in this profession of humane policy he was governed by his persistent zeal for the old worship, and seriously believed that its interests would be best served by a marked abstinence from the barbarities of Galerius or of Maximin.

But while he thus forbore to declare open war against Christianity, and, indeed, was to a considerable extent influenced in this resolve by obvious prudential considerations, he determined to discourage the profession of Christianity by all other means at the command of an absolute monarch; in fact, he could employ six methods of this kind for the restoration of pagan supremacy. First, as he wrote to Artebius, "while he did not intend that the Galilæans should be put to death, or otherwise injured, contrary to justice, he laid it down as a rule that the followers of the 'true'

worship ought to be preferred to them." He conceived that it would be quite possible to keep his cause free from the obloquy of cruelty, or of the persecution of religious belief as such, and yet to undermine what he could not storm, to discourage what he could not proscribe, and to confine his favours and his confidence to those who adhered to, or who would conform to, the old ritual. Secondly, he could employ all the resources of imperial persuasion, personal appeals, promises, gifts, promotion, in order to win over Christians who should come under his notice—a method which succeeded in the case of a few unprincipled waiters on fortune, but failed with noble souls like Gregory's brother Cæsarius, a young physician of eminent ability. Thirdly, he could tacitly condone any demonstration of anti-Christian passion on the part of the heathen populations, who might easily be impelled by hatred of Christians to acts of violence, or even of slaughter. Fourthly, he could exhibit Christianity in an unfavourable light by elaborate controversial attacks, in which, as his extant polemic shows by its indescribable narrowness and pettiness, he did but display his own inability to understand the spirit of the religion which he tried to argue out of court; and also by all that power of sarcasm, which was one of the features of his Greek-like volubility. Fifthly, he could take in hand a much-needed reform of the existing pagan society, and especially of its priesthood; he would not disdain to borrow hints from the Christian system in matters connected with moral and social virtue; in short, he thought he saw his way to a result which would at once re-establish the credit of "Hellenism," and give effect to his own sincere aversion for the sensuality which its atmosphere had nursed. And lastly, he could patronise the Jewish body, which still, through its wealth and internal unity, was a power to be reckoned with. Constantine had conferred on it some privileges, but at the same time had warned it not to harass converts from Judaism to Christianity; and it was still on the watch for opportunities of showing its hatred to the name and to the worshippers of "the Crucified Man."

And what was the existing force to which he could appeal? Paganism had not been crushed in the East by the influence of "Christian" emperors; it had much of real life left in it, and indeed was destined to show long afterwards that no government, however Christian, could dispense with the services of its ablest representatives. In the West it was far stronger, and in the old imperial city it possessed a seemingly impregnable fortress. Christianity,

in the heyday of its prosperity, had made many enemies, who would be more than ready to welcome a new era. And Julian himself, at little more than thirty years of age, might reasonably count on a long reign as the unquestioned heir of the Constantinian house; his renown as a general had been established by his Gallic campaign, and he was conscious of no small gifts for political administration; he was a practised speaker, whose tongue, says the pagan historian in gently satirical fashion, was very rarely silent; he was not less ready with his pen—a writer of orations, satires, pamphlets;—why might he not succeed in elaborate controversy? Thus we can well imagine that when, in the first days of his reign, he threw himself enthusiastically not only into the dignified functions of a supreme pontiff, but into all "the meanest offices" of a pagan sacrificer—when he, the Augustus, astonished even his fellow-pagans by "bringing the wood or blowing the fire, slaying the victims, and thrusting his hands into their entrails" in order to collect infallible indications of the will of the gods from the appearances of the heart or the liver—he recked little of the criticism, rather whispered than uttered, which regarded such assiduity as "odd, extreme, undignified, in bad taste." His hopes of success in a task which he knew to be arduous would sustain him, or rather would animate him, in presence of any difficulties or any objections; he relied on "Helios" as an all-sufficing patron, and felt sure that what Diocletian had failed to achieve by the rough method of persecution would in time be the crowning success of his own more varied and resourceful policy.

If, at the outset, the display of an anti-Christian programme provoked some Christian zealots to a violent expression of their hostility against restored temples and altars, the penalty inflicted would be, in his view, a simple vindication of public order; and any who thus suffered would not by any right be honoured as martyrs. Nor can we deny that he showed good judgment by his next edict for the recall of all bishops who, for any reason, had been banished under Constantius. Whatever was his real motive, we can hardly wonder that he was supposed to be aiming at two objects—the credit of liberality on the one hand, and on the other the renewal of those dissensions which had discredited Christianity. As Sozomen expresses it, "he is said to have commanded this, not from any wish to show favour to the bishops who had been exiled, but partly to blacken the memory of Constantius, and partly in the hope that the Church would be involved in an intestine

strife by the contentiousness of Christians, and would thus deviate from its own laws." Or as Ammianus, an unsuspected witness, tells us, "he invited the heads of the different Christian sects into his palace, and exhorted them to abate their dissensions; but his real object was that those dissensions might be aggravated by liberty, so that he might no longer have to confront an united Christian body." In these conferences he used sometimes to exclaim, "Listen to me! the Alamanni have listened to me, and the Franks." But he was disappointed in the expectation that a large number of Christian bishops would be induced to exhibit the weak side of their cause by wrangling with each other for the amusement of the pagans who surrounded him; and, in fact, the common danger to the whole Christian cause was soon found to have the effect of suppressing, or at least of moderating, the vehemence of controversy between professing Christians. For, says one of the Church historians, "men who are attacked by foreign enemies are fain to keep the peace with one another."

Julian proceeded to gratify his spleen against the Christians by revoking all grants of privilege to their clergy. The much-prized exemption of Christian ecclesiastics from burdensome civic offices, such as the vexatious and often ruinous obligations of the decurionate, was now cancelled by the Emperor. "Let those decurions who decline to serve, on the ground of being Christians, be recalled (to their duty)." Another law restrained the free use, by large classes of persons throughout the empire, of the so-called *cursus publicus:* the object of this enactment was "to strike at the Christians without naming them;" for it was of frequent occurrence in the late reign that prelates, especially Arians, were seen, in the caustic language of Ammianus, "hurrying, in crowds, and mounted at the public expense, to what they called their synods." A third enactment restored to the various cities all property which had been alienated from them: "We command public possessions to be restored to the cities." This alienation had often been made with a view to the building of churches; and thus, by a brief law which did not even name the Christians or their places of worship, Julian "implicitly commanded the destruction of many a Christian sanctuary." The execution of this law, in effect, called forth all the passions of the heathen populations, which in some places were most ferocious against the religion which had, during so many years past, predominated with ever-increasing imperiousness over the ruined or decaying strongholds of idolatry. If in

some cities and districts, as at Edessa, or at Cæsarea in Cappadocia, or at Maiuma, the port of Gaza, the whole population was enthusiastically devoted to the Christian faith—if in others, as Berœa, only a few of the "curia" or municipal corporation were well inclined to the old idolatry—there were others, as Alexandria, which still contained a large pagan element, and others like Carrhæ, and Heliopolis near Mount Lebanon, and Gaza, and Anthedon, and Arethusa in Syria, which were remarkable for an intense and furious animosity against Christianity and its adherents. In such places as these, Julian's accession awoke reactionary hopes, and his order for the "restoration of public property" became a signal for reactionary violence. Mark, bishop of Arethusa, who is said to have been directly instrumental in the preservation of Julian's young life, had, as Sozomen candidly confesses, "carried his zeal for the conversion of the inhabitants beyond the limits of persuasion." In the days of Constantius, he had actually destroyed a stately temple; he was now commanded either to rebuild it, or to defray the cost of its rebuilding. He would not do the former; he could not do the latter. He fled, but hearing that several of his flock were being harassed and tormented in his absence, and on his account, he returned, and gave himself up to the magistrates: whereupon the savage mob rushed upon him, stripped and beat him, dragged him about, thrust him into the sewers, set the very schoolboys at him to toss him aloft and to and fro, and receive his body by turns on their iron writing-pens. When thus barbarously lacerated, he was hung up in a basket amid the blazing sunshine, and smeared with sauce and honey, in order to invite the attack of bees and wasps; from which "lofty station," as Gibbon calls it, the indomitable old man derided his persecutors as "creatures grovelling far below himself," and foretold a similar contrast in their respective conditions through eternity. His endurance greatly damaged the pagan cause, for even the enemies of his faith were struck with admiration: he was at last released, after refusing to pay anything whatever—even a greatly abated sum—towards the restoration of the temple; and was dismissed, in Gibbon's words, "to enjoy the honour of his divine triumph."

Similar scenes, and others still more revolting, were enacted in other parts of Syria. At Ascalon and Gaza, priests, laymen, and consecrated virgins were put to death with hideous atrocities. The deacon Cyril at Heliopolis, an ardent idol-breaker under Constantius, was killed by the vengeful pagans, who absolutely tore

out and devoured his liver. Christian churches were burned at Damascus, at Berytus, and doubtless in many other places where the civil authorities lent themselves to the popular fury: at Emesa a recently erected church was turned into a temple of Bacchus Androgynos, as Julian had set up the image of Fortune in the desecrated cathedral of Constantinople. At Antioch a pagan priest was about to destroy a Christian's dwelling erected on the site of an old temple, when Libanius, with memorable fair-mindedness, interposed, and asserted that "Theodulus had every right to retain the house which had become legally his property;" and similarly he pleaded for a Christian of Bostra named Orion, observing that the senseless barbarities practised on Mark could not be imitated without disgrace and loss to the cause of which their perpetrators had imagined themselves champions. Julian himself, though averse from cruelty, and desirous of securing a reputation for benevolence, fell far below Libanius in his estimate of the true character of these local outrages. He "dissembled as long as possible his knowledge of the injustice which was exercised in his name." He "connived," says Theodoret, at the outrages committed: a recent biographer admits that he "culpably condoned some pagan excesses:" to use Gibbon's words again, he "expressed his real sense of the conduct of his officers by gentle reproofs and substantial rewards," and gave vent to his scornful bitterness against the "Galilæans," the "worshippers," as he called them, "of the Dead Man," in taunts which Frederick II. of Prussia might, on more than one occasion, have seemed to imitate, but which Boissier prefers to call "des sarcasmes de *théologien enragé*." "'Tis your duty," he would say to Christians who appealed to his justice,—"'tis your duty to bear these afflictions patiently: for this is the command of your God." At the same time it is but fair to remember that he himself could sometimes show great self-command under provocations which would have thrown Constantius into fury. Maris, the blind old bishop of Chalcedon (who had been one of the Eusebian deputies to Constans in 342), caused himself to be led by a child into the Emperor's presence, while he was sacrificing to Fortune in the desecrated church of St. Sophia, and reproached him for his impiety and apostasy. Julian sneeringly answered, "Your Galilæan God will never cure your blindness." "I thank my God," retorted Maris, "that I *am* blind, and unable to see the face of such an apostate!" Julian, says Sozomen, turned away in silence; but Socrates tells us that he afterwards took a severe revenge.

We must now observe his conduct in reference to the most remarkable of all the pagan outbreaks of this period. George, the usurper of the throne of Athanasius, had been the oppressor of pagans and Catholics alike. Already he had been obliged to leave the city, in consequence of a popular movement which had beset him in the church of St. Dionysius—as the Fragmentary Chronicle of Alexandrian events informs us—in the year 357. He had returned under the wing of civil and military power; he had renewed his insolences and violences, had stooped to the base trade of a *delator*, "forgetful," says Ammianus, "of his Christian profession, which suggests nothing but what is just and gentle;" and had specially offended the Alexandrian pagans by a speech which, if uttered by a Catholic bishop, would probably have been eulogized as an outburst of godly zeal. "How long," he cried, looking at "a beautiful temple of a Genius"—so Ammianus tells the story, —"how long will this sepulchre stand?" Supposed as he was to be the adviser and abettor of all the measures by which Artemius, the governor of Egypt, had earned the hatred of the pagans of Alexandria—such as a heavy taxation on all houses, and an armed invasion and spoliation of the mighty temple of Serapis —the Arian bishop had cause to tremble for his life, when news came to Alexandria that a new reign had begun, and perhaps that Artemius had been put to death, by Julian's orders, at Antioch. The exultant pagans rushed in irresistible numbers to George's house, seized him, flung him into prison, and after twenty-four days dragged him forth, beat and kicked him to death (much after the fashion in which tradition or legend has described the martyrdom of St. Mark in the same city); and then, after exhibiting the mangled remains, flung over a camel's back, in various quarters of the city, they burned them to ashes on the seashore, expressly in order to prevent them from being collected as relics, like those, says Ammianus, of the men "who persevered in constancy to their religion even to a glorious death, and are now called martyrs." Philostorgius boldly ascribes this murder to the counsels of Athanasius, and Ammianus insinuates that the Catholics of Alexandria might have protected the life of George, but refrained from interfering in the cause of their enemy; and he proceeds to tell us how Julian was gradually induced to abandon his first intention of inflicting extreme punishment on the murderers, and to content himself with addressing to the people of Alexandria a letter of stern remonstrance on the inhuman brutality which had

disgraced a city of Greek origin, honoured by the presence and worship of Serapis "the great and holy god." To the prefect of Egypt he at the same time despatched a curious epistle, directing him to rescue and secure for his use the valuable library, containing works on philosophy and rhetoric, and on the theology of "the impious Galilæans," which had attested the literary culture of the Cappadocian parasite, the fraudulent army-contractor, the Arian intruder, persecutor, and tyrant.

With the cases of mob-fury must be combined those in which provincial governors outran Julian's orders, or license, and put Christians to death. If the martyrdom of "John and Paul" at Rome be historical, it took place by the authority of the pagan prefect Apronianus, who probably supposed the Christians to be guilty of magic; and when that word was pronounced, sheer terror could show itself in any amount of cruelty. But these inflictions were generally for acts of "zeal," as Christians would call it, against the restoration of temples or images, as when Amachius, in Phrygia, put to death (the same death as St. Laurence's) three Christians—Macedonius, Theodulus, and Tatian —for breaking in pieces some newly polished images at Meros, or when Æmilian at Dorotorum in Thrace was burnt alive by Capitolinus for destroying altars, or Eupsychius, at Cæsarea in Cappadocia, was put to death for destroying a temple of Fortune. A worse case was that of the priest Basil at Ancyra, who after praying aloud, as he looked at pagans sacrificing, that no Christian might fall into such delusions, suffered death under the hands of the local governor, and, as Sozomen implies and we may well believe, *not* by Julian's express command.

Another method of the policy of discouragement, as distinct from open persecution, will be found in his conduct towards the Christians in the army. He himself, at his accession, spoke of the majority of his troops as "devoted to the worship of the gods;" and Gregory admits that very many were led astray into conformity with the Emperor's religion, although, as he expresses it, "'more than seven thousand men' were left, who would not bend a knee to Baal, nor worship the golden image." Julian, in fact, was encouraged to hope for a general acquiescence in paganism on the part of his troops, not only from the example of complacent apostasy set by such persons as Hekebolius the "sophist," or Felix and Elpidius, both of them high officers in his household, or even by one "ultra-liberal" bishop, Pegasius of New Troy—men

whose baseness contrasted with the fair-mindedness and self-respect of such a pagan as Candidian, a correspondent of Gregory Nazianzen —but from the natural influence which his successful military career in the West would give him over soldiers whose hearts were in their calling. Accordingly, he sometimes, as Sozomen tells us, addressed the Christian soldiers individually, sometimes through their officers, and, to accustom them to the visible presence of ensigns which represented the ancient alliance between the pagan worship and the military life, he abolished the use of the Labarum— "the great standard," says Gregory, "which elevates the Cross on high in front of the ranks"—and restored the old standard of "the senate and people of Rome." He placed the images of the gods in juxtaposition with his own, so that it was difficult to render the usual salutation to the likeness of the monarch without paying a constructive homage to Jupiter, or Mercury, or Mars, who were represented as turning their eyes, in token of favour, towards the Emperor who had restored their worship. Only a few, we are told, saw through this artifice, or, if that term be thought too harsh, appreciated the difficulty thus created; the rest, mechanically or thoughtlessly, bowed to the images thus combined. His next "machination," says Sozomen, "was more transparent," and was therefore a better test of a soldier's character and courage. On certain festival days, when donations were distributed to the army, soldiers who approached to receive them were ordered first to throw incense on an altar erected near the place where the Emperor was seated. It was on such an occasion that some Christian soldiers who had unthinkingly complied with this command were afterwards sitting over their wine, and, in pledging each other, invoked the name of Christ, whereupon a heathen comrade taunted them with inconsistency: "Just now, for the sake of the Emperor's gift, you renounced your Christ by throwing incense on the fire." The men started up in an agony of grief and remorse, ran out into the street with passionate outcries, protested aloud that they had not meant to abjure their faith, and even rushed into Julian's presence, and called on him to take back the gifts which they had incautiously accepted, and to inflict on them as Christians whatever he thought fit. We may set it down to Julian's credit that he inflicted nothing worse than exile, including, of course, removal from their posts in the army. Among those officers who consistently avowed their faith were three who lived to become Emperors—Jovian, and the brothers Valentinian and Valens. Of

Valentinian it is said that when, as one of the guards of Julian, he was about to enter a temple with him, the pagan priest sprinkled some water over his military cloak, and thereupon he tore off and flung away the piece which had thus been sullied, and was banished soon afterwards into Armenia—not on the ground of this act, but on the pretext of some negligence in military duty during Julian's stay at Antioch. Two other body-guards, Juventinus and Maximinus, boldly remonstrated with the Emperor for his insidious cruelty in causing the bread, meat, and other articles of food exposed for sale in the market-place, to be sprinkled with the water of pagan sacrifices. Julian on this occasion departed from his rule of forbearance, and the two soldiers died by the sword; but here too he was careful to disclaim the motives of a persecutor, and gave out that their death was a punishment of insolence to their Emperor.

He adopted a similar line in regard to offices in his court, and to posts of provincial government. He excluded all who would not sacrifice to the gods from all such places of trust; and with one of his disingenuous references to the sacred books of Christians, affirmed that their law forbade them to use the sword against criminals, however worthy of capital punishment.

But a third plan was far more malignant, and deservedly drew down special obloquy on the name of Julian. He at first put forth, in June, 362, an edict requiring that all public teachers must receive the sanction of the *curiales* or town-councillors in cities; but this enactment was not enough for his impatience. He went further: as Socrates briefly expresses it, he enacted a law "forbidding Christians to partake of education;" a more correct account is Jerome's in his Chronicle, "it forbade Christians to be teachers of liberal arts:" but the phrase is too brief to be fully descriptive, and we must look for full information to what is reckoned as the 42nd letter of Julian, probably written at Antioch, in which he himself, giving full play to his vein of sarcasm, and remarking on the inconsistency, as he represents it, involved in the act of teaching pupils out of books which the teacher regards as fraught with falsehood, ordains that no Christian shall give instruction in the studies of Greek antiquity. Greek writings, he urges, are full of references to the gods: any one who objects to such references may "go into the churches of the Galilæans, and there expound Matthew and Luke;" it ought to be no hardship to him to be interdicted from lecturing on what he cannot

conscientiously approve. The unfairness of this edict, which the pagan historian would fain have seen "buried in eternal silence," and which the modern unbelieving historian denounces as "partial and oppressive," was patent and gross enough without the exaggeration which sometimes represented it as actually forbidding Christian boys to frequent the public teachers. Julian did *not* forbid them to learn the pagan classics; but his edict, incapacitating their Christian lecturers, would of course indirectly close the doors of the schools against many of the pupils, who would not be allowed by their parents to study under avowed enemies of the faith. Jerome tells us that Proæresius, who held one of the chairs which Marcus Aurelius had founded at Athens, resigned his post when this law was promulgated, although Julian had made an exception in his favour. The vexatious law, however, was "unwise for the very purpose contemplated;" it became the means of calling forth a singular versatility and activity on the part of some highly educated Christians. The two Apollinares, father and son, of Laodicea in Syria, who, as we have seen, had been long distinguished by their attainments, and had also shown their zeal for the Catholic faith by their fervent attachment to its great Egyptian representative, set to work to compose books on the model of the great classical authors, in which the truths of religion should be set forth. The elder, according to Socrates, wrote a grammar, translated the Pentateuch into heroic verse, and produced metrical paraphrases of other books of the Old Testament; while the younger, destined ere long to an unhappy notoriety, wrote an argumentative treatise on Christianity in the form of the Platonic dialogue, and also a translation of the Psalms into heroic verse, which is still extant. These curious works had a temporary success, but were naturally neglected after the emergency which produced them was removed. One interesting result of their dissemination is the passage in which Socrates considers the objections which a strictly religious Christian might be tempted to bring against the study of pagan literature; and in which he summarises the view which, if not all, yet the greater number of eminent Church writers would take of the question by an expansion of the traditional precept, "Be ye approved money-changers," and the apostolic maxim, "Prove all things, hold fast the good." The historian expresses his own mind in a golden sentence, "Wherever anything excellent is found, it is the property of the truth." But Julian himself was ambitious of distinction as an author: he would follow

in the track of Celsus and Porphyry; and his controversial treatise against Christians, known to us through the extracts made by Cyril of Alexandria in his reply to it, betrays a total, radical misconception of the religion which he assailed, combined with fretful bitterness and an affected rationalism inconsistent with his own superstition. Here are a few specimens: "Your Christian Scriptures cannot make any men wiser or better. If Christianity does not make people slavish, set me down as a babbler. It is a legendary invention of men, involving belief in absurd figments. If you revere the Old Testament, why do you not still observe passovers and sabbaths? What folly to erect fishermen into theologians, or to make much of a few healings in a few towns of Syria! Baptism cannot cure leprosy, yet you pretend that it can cure a disease of the soul. No one ventured to call Christ 'God' until the good-natured John did so, and even he only after finding out that Christians were venerating the tombs of Peter and Paul." His favourite name for our Lord is "the Carpenter's Son;" he does not insult Him, but superciliously gives Him the go-by, and is totally blind to the significance of His teaching and His character.

Let us now pass to two memorable cases in which Julian signified his feelings in reference to the Church of Christ, while dealing with pagans and with Jews. He was fully sensible of the attractions exercised by Christian charity and strictness of life. In a "fragmentary" paper, and in a letter to the pagan high-priest of Galatia, he exhorts priests of the gods to appropriate for the service of "Hellenic" religion the modest gravity of deportment, the severe purity, the avoidance of all demoralising scenes, the active benevolence to sufferers, the reverent treatment of the dead, the self-respect in the presence of civil dignitaries, which were so impressive and so influential when observed in the conduct of Christian clergy. He orders daily sacrifice, and forbids his priests even to read the writings of any sceptical philosopher. In this whole line of action he strove desperately, as we may express it, to elevate and to spiritualise the paganism which he had again enthroned, and whose adherents, all the while, looked on with amused wonder at a pietism which they could not appreciate; to them it was an eccentricity, or what would now be called a "fad." He would fain have seen pagan temples used for real prayer and for ethical preaching; he even wished to adopt into the pagan system the potent institution of penitential discipline, to

found monasteries for "philosophic" asceticism, to open hospitals for the relief of needy strangers, in which Hellenic philanthropy should prove itself a match for Christian love; and he was yet more earnestly bent on introducing the system of "letters of commendation" which, as worked by Christian prelates, had been so efficacious in consolidating the Christian brotherhood. It is piteous to see the "Apostate" thus elaborately struggling to obtain, so to say, the flowers and the fruit, in separation from the stock which alone could produce them: in this, as in other cases, he exhibits the superficiality of his own acquaintance with the religion which he had abjured, but whose strength and charm he could not wholly ignore. Nay, more; we may well say that he was utterly blind to the ingrained corruption of the system which he sought to rehabilitate. It was hopelessly vicious, incurably frivolous; it neither would nor could be made serious and moral; to attempt its regeneration was like breathing into the mouth of a corpse.

In his treatment of the Jews, the Emperor gave expression to a very different feeling: he had a certain sort of liking for their nationality; although he denounced the Old Testament theology as immoral and degrading, and sneered at the prophets as fit only to talk to old women, he thought he saw his way to employing their ardent hopes and aims in a direction which might tend to the discredit of Christianity. Taking advantage of the answer which some of their number made to his question, "Why do you not offer the sacrifices which Moses prescribed to you?" Julian permitted them to undertake the rebuilding of their temple, and exulted in the prospect of thus falsifying the prediction ascribed to Christ. He intrusted the superintendence of the work to Alypius of Antioch, who had previously held command in Britain. This officer had now an opportunity of seeing the Jewish character in all its intense energy, starting up with buoyant hopefulness to take in hand a business which beyond all others appealed to the Jewish heart. He might watch the eager crowds thronging into Jerusalem, their faces bright with suddenly rekindled hope, and expressive, no doubt, of defiant exultation as they passed before the eyes of Christian spectators; he might see Jewish ladies, regardless of their dresses, carrying in their arms earth for the purposes of the workmen; he might observe the spades and mattocks of silver which, at the cost of treasured pieces of family property, were procured for the rebuilding of the "holy house;" he might hear how Bishop Cyril had calmly reminded his fellow-Christians

of the infallible prophecy that no stone should be left upon another within the precinct of that temple which had been abandoned and doomed by God. And he would be among the first to receive tidings of the strange, the appalling obstacles which, as the pagan historian affirms, definitely cut short the work, and disappointed the hopes of the Jews and his master. Ammianus was not a man to be imposed on by a Christian invention; and he says that "terrible balls of fire burst forth near the foundations, and by their repeated attacks drove the workmen, after several scorchings, from the spot; and thus, the element obstinately repelling them, the work which they had begun was broken off." Gregory adds to this statement that a whirlwind and an earthquake drove some who were standing by to take shelter in a neighbouring church, that a luminous cross, surrounded by a circle, appeared in the sky, and that the marks of crosses were impressed on the garments of beholders. To these portents, which Christian fancy might easily create, other details are added by later writers: as by Rufinus, who tells us that the marks proved ineffaceable; by Socrates, who depicts the fire preying for one whole day on all the workmen's tools; by Sozomen and Theodoret, who speak of the crosses on the garments as star-shaped and of a blackish hue. The fact of the eruption of fire from the recesses below the temple area must be considered as proved beyond dispute, whatever cause we may prefer to assign for it: we may, as Robertson says, "reverently believe" that this was an occasion on which natural forces might be not only permitted to act, but combined and intensified in their destructive energy, for the high purpose of vindicating the Divine word, and confounding the project of an anti-Christian power; so that although the agencies employed were in themselves natural, their concurrence with a moral order of things might constitute a "sign" from God. But perhaps the practical aspect of Julian towards the Christians is exhibited with the most significant, in one case with the most dramatic vividness, by his proceedings in regard to the city of Antioch, and to the archbishop of Alexandria.

Let us follow him to the birthplace of the Christian name. He had quitted Constantinople in May, 362, and travelled, as Ammianus tells us, by way of Galatia, taking care to visit the ancient shrine of Cybele at Pessinus, and thence through Cilicia to the "beautiful crown of all the East"—that Antioch which he had so greatly longed to see, but for which a few months' residence was to give him a fixed and bitter aversion. The eager welcome of an

advancing crowd, the cry of "Lo, a star of safety risen over the East!" was strangely followed up by the wailings of the pagan women for Adonis, at their midsummer commemoration of his fabled death, the symbolic representation of the waning and decay of physical forces. "It seemed a mournful coincidence," says Ammianus, naturally enough. We are not concerned to trace the growth of his disappointment with the Antiochenes. Enough to say that while he was, morally speaking, too elevated in tone, too intolerant of coarse or ignoble pleasures, to harmonize with the extravagant pleasure-seeking which then, as later, characterized the voluptuous "Oriental" capital, and which seems to be illustrated by Libanius's complaint that professors were better paid at Cæsarea in Cappadocia, Julian had an opposite reason for disgust in the evident predominance of the Christian profession even at a place where, as it might seem, there was so much that offended Christian purity. The city, he says, was more abandoned to luxury than Tarentum itself; it contrasted with the decorum of Athens; it contained more actors than citizens; it was impatient of all restraint, as of mere slavery; but, he complains almost in the same breath, the great majority of its inhabitants took Christ, not Zeus or Apollo, for their Protector, and expressed in a well-understood phrase their ill-feeling towards a prince who had "made war upon the *Chi*,"—in contrast to neighbouring cities which at his bidding had joyfully destroyed "the sepulchres of the atheists," and avenged the cause of the gods more severely than he had himself desired. They had never been accustomed to restrain their sarcasm as to royal eccentricities which invited it; they had applied nicknames to their Seleucid kings, and they were not at all disposed to be respectfully silent about an Emperor whose outward man was conspicuously unmajestic. The short stature, the shabby dress, and still more the long untrimmed beard which "might be made into ropes," were constant themes for their acrid wit: they called him "the Man of Victims;" they resented his rare attendance at the circus-games, his hurrying away before they were half over, his want of sympathy with "pleasure," much in the same temper in which pagan populations had resented the Christians' absence from public festivities, their "unsocial" antipathy to popular enjoyments; and he replied, in a work called "The Beardhater," by lashing their vicious frivolity on one hand and their predilection for Christianity on the other, and remarked with special annoyance that Christian wives exercised

influence over husbands who did not profess Christianity. A few weeks after his arrival, in the month of Lous or August, he repaired to the temple of Apollo in the "polluted but most lovely grove" of Daphne, rich in the foliage of bay and cypress fondly imagined by pagans to banish all maladies, but associated with a legend which his contempt for sensual debasement would doubtless lead him to explain away, and with a practical consecration of vice which would be as odious to him as it would have been to Constantius. In expectation of a gorgeous festal sacrifice, the imperial enthusiast for pagan ritual, and particularly for the worship of Helios, arrived at the temple-gate, and found no worshippers, no incense, not a cake or a victim for sacrifice. Where were the people? he asked. Were they outside the precinct, awaiting a signal from himself as supreme pontiff? What sacrifice was the city going to offer on that great anniversary solemnity? One priest alone was there to answer: "The city sends nothing, but I have a goose which I will offer to the god!" The poor priest had a young son, who went through his function of pouring sacrificial water on the food afterwards presented to Julian, and then—being secretly a convert to Christianity—hastened to a deaconess at Antioch, who had taught him the faith, and who found him shelter, for a time, in the house of the bishop Meletius. This was the first scene of the drama, so to speak, of Julian at Daphne. The second opened with his consultation of the Daphnæan oracle, connected with the "Castalian fount." But "there was no voice, nor any to answer." The disappointing silence was explained to Julian as the result of a profanation: the body of Babylas, a bishop martyred in the third century, had been buried by the late Cæsar Gallus in the midst of Apollo's sacred grove, and the god could not speak until "the dead man" was removed, or, as Libanius expresses it, until he was "relieved of a pestilent neighbour." Julian promptly answered, "Then let the Galilæans take the body away." The order was obeyed with an enthusiasm which he had not reckoned upon evoking; a vast crowd of Christians took possession of the venerated remains, elevated them on a lofty chariot, and conveyed them to Antioch (five miles' distance) in triumphant procession, with a thunder of choral psalmody, in which one emphatic verse, repeated at intervals like a refrain, expressed their defiance alike of Apollo and his imperial votary, "Confounded be all they who worship carved images, and that delight in vain gods!" The Emperor could not but be incensed at such a demonstration: he ordered his friend the

prefect Sallust to make an example of some offenders; and accordingly a youth named Theodore, the first person who was caught, was next day put to the torture from daybreak until 4 p.m., with no other effect, says Rufinus—who afterwards heard him tell the story—than to draw forth from his lips the same verse which he had sung in the procession. The precinct was, as Julian expresses it, "given back to those who were indignant about the remains of the dead man;" in other words, a process of lustration was begun, and Julian was awaiting its completion when, on the 22nd of October, the temple itself was suddenly burnt down, while its ancient splendour was being renewed by a stately colonnade. Julian suspected the Christians of having caused this calamity: they, for their parts, were not slow to point to the judgment of God on a stronghold of evil spirits. Another account described the fire as accidental; a pagan philosopher had placed a little image at the feet of the great statue, had lighted some papers, and had forgetfully left them burning, so that their sparks caught the building at dead of night. Tortures were employed, with unusual severity, to discover the guilty parties, but in vain; whereupon Julian ordered the cathedral, "the Golden Church," to be closed, and its Arian occupants were thus compelled to assemble elsewhere. A namesake of his, Julian, "Count" (equivalent to "Vicarius") of the "diocese of the Orient" of which Antioch was the capital, went with "Counts" Felix and Elpidius into the sanctuary, under orders to carry off the altar-vessels. Euzoius accompanied them, and tried in vain to restrain Count Julian from insulting the sanctity of the place. Felix looked at the chalices, which were the costly gifts of Christian monarchs: "See," he said with a scoff, "in what kind of vessels they do service to the Son of Mary!" Count Julian's death soon followed, and was ascribed by the Christians to a divine judgment; and Felix, we are told, who, like Julian and Elpidius, was an apostate, was seized with a profuse hæmorrhage which proved fatal. An aged deaconess, in whose house lived a number of devoted women, contributed to the Emperor's irritation by singing when he passed by—in spite of rebukes, and even of blows from a soldier's hand—psalms directed against idolatry.

These were among the many mortifications which embittered the Emperor's stay at Antioch, and contributed to produce in his mind a detestation of that city, which all the eloquence of Libanius was insufficient to soften or to soothe. But he had already, in the

year preceding that early spring of 363 in which he quitted Antioch for his fatal Persian expedition, given full expression to his aversion for the one man who represented the Christian cause more effectively than all its Antiochene adherents. From the very outset, he had, as Gibbon tersely words it, "honoured Athanasius with his sincere and peculiar hatred." "Towards Athanasius," says Rufinus, "he could not keep up the appearance of his affected philosophy." The bands of magicians, philosophers, haruspices, and augurs, who came flocking around his throne, are credited by this writer with persuading Julian that their plans "would never prosper until Athanasius was out of the way." The great archbishop had taken advantage of the edict recalling the exiled bishops, which had reached Alexandria on the 8th of February, 362, just six years after the memorable attack on St. Theonas's church. In pursuance of this mandate, the prefect Gerontius, taking for granted that it was to apply to the case of Athanasius, put forth an official notice, inviting him to return. Accordingly, he entered his church on the 27th of Mechir, or 21st of February, according to the Maffeian "Chronicler;" and was doubtless received with rapturous welcome, even if the description previously quoted from Gregory pertains, in fact, to an earlier return. The Arians had, after the death of George, set up Lucius as their chief; but he could only meet his adherents in "mean little houses," and was constrained to abandon all contest with the mighty and, as it seemed, invincible representative of the Nicene faith. The ecclesiastical proceedings of Athanasius during eight months of tranquillity were among the most characteristic and most fruitful of all his episcopate; but they will be more conveniently considered hereafter. It appears that soon after his return Julian wrote to the Alexandrians, introducing, as Gibbon says, an "arbitrary distinction" to the effect that he had never intended the bishops who returned from exile to resume their sees: he was afraid that Athanasius had done so, and therefore ordered that he should at once depart from Alexandria. He seems to have taken for granted that this order would suffice, and dismissed the matter from his consideration. But in the October of 362, when fresh from the irritations of the scenes connected with the sanctuary of Daphne, he was only too ready to listen to complaints, denunciations, passionate cries for imperial interference, which poured in upon him from the pagans of Alexandria after their new experience of the success of Athanasius in the consolidation of the

Christian body, and the rekindling of its energy and zeal. In particular, they informed Julian that, instead of obeying the command to depart, Athanasius had converted and baptized several high-born pagan ladies. On the other hand, the Christians of Alexandria had petitioned for a remission of the sentence against their bishop. But Julian was not likely to grant such a request. In high wrath, he wrote to the Alexandrians, reproaching them for being thus infatuated on behalf of Athanasius, as if no one could gratify their morbid eagerness for Christian sermons but a man dangerous as a popular busybody; and informing them that he long ago ordered that "despicable mannikin" to leave Alexandria, and that he now commanded him to depart from Egypt. Another letter, to the prefect Ecdicius, exhibits still keener animosity: Athanasius is called an "abominable wretch, the enemy of the gods;" and the prefect's official staff is threatened with a heavy fine if Athanasius is not out of Alexandria, or rather out of Egypt, by the 1st of December. The letter concludes with one emphatic word, "Let him be persecuted." The archbishop obeyed the order before the time here designated: the Alexandrian documents make him depart before the end of October, and we know that he consoled his friends by the prediction, "It is only a little cloud, it will soon pass." He was pursued, perhaps by the over-zealous promptitude of Julian's messenger, on his voyage up the Nile: with ready presence of mind he turned his boat's head round, and so met the pursuer, who did not know him, and demanded, "Have you seen Athanasius?" "He is not far off," replied some of the archbishop's companions; the hostile party shot on ahead, and Athanasius quietly returned to the neighbourhood of Alexandria, to a place called Chereu, and then, somewhat later, repaired to the Thebaid, where he waited for the "passing of the cloud."

That event came sooner than those Christians could have expected, who saw the year 363 open with such elaborate preparations for a grand Persian campaign. But as the Emperor advanced further eastward, his prospects of success grew darker; and it was after such a display of bad generalship, contrasting with previous military skill, as a Christian might ascribe to mysterious infatuation, that, on June 26, 363, the Apostate's death—though not his dying words, which exhibit a "philosophic self-complacency"—proclaimed that "the Galilæan *had* conquered." Let us part from this most unhappy man with the recollection that he had not really forsaken Christ, for he had never learned Him nor known Him.

CHAPTER XVII.

INTERNAL CHURCH AFFAIRS UNDER JULIAN.

We have taken a general survey of the reign of Julian considered in its relations to Christianity and the Church. It remains to pay attention to two events, of great, though not, perhaps, of equal importance, which belong to the internal life of the Church during his reign. One of these is the memorable Alexandrian Council, held by Athanasius between his "third return" and his "fourth exile;" the other is the renewed outbreak of the Donatist troubles in Western Africa.

Gibbon, who had a genuine admiration for the greatness of "the primate of Egypt," admits that when he reassumed his throne in February, 362, "the exercise of his authority tended not to inflame, but to reconcile, the minds of the people; that his age, merit, and reputation enabled him to assume, in a moment of danger, the office of ecclesiastical dictator." This, however, is not by any means a correct description of his position in the year 362, or indeed at any time. He was a moderator, a reconciler, a general adviser, a point of attraction, a moral centre of unity. If Tillemont calls him, in this crisis, a virtual "legislator" of Christendom, it was by the exercise of an influence inseparable from his character, with its wonderful union of strength and tenderness, of immovable constancy and patient equity, that he who could so truly, in the Pauline sense, make himself all things to all men, impressed his own mind on a distracted Church, and stood forth as its practical reorganizer.

The Edict of Recall had brought Eusebius of Vercellæ and Lucifer of Caliaris from their places of exile, in the Thebaid, into Lower Egypt. Eusebius entreated Lucifer to come with him to Alexandria, and visit Athanasius, that a conference might be held upon some questions of urgent importance. These were five in number. Two of them related to troubles and scandals which

directly affected the unity of the Church. Three others related to theological differences, or to tendencies of unsound thought, which appeared likely to produce fresh confusion, and therefore demanded prompt and judicious treatment. We must now describe them more particularly, and explain the treatment which they received from a small Council of some seventeen bishops which met at Alexandria in the spring of 362, but without the presence of the impatient Sardinian, who had hurried on to Antioch.

(1) The Orthodox of Antioch were now a twofold body. The Old-Churchmen, so to call them, or "Eustathians," with whom Athanasius had fraternised in 346, worshipped under the care of the highly respected presbyter Paulinus, in a small church within the "New City," which Euzoius—with a liberality, and respect for Catholic earnestness, which did him credit—permitted them to use. They would not join with the adherents of Meletius; their view was, that although Meletius had, before his exile, professed, essentially, the Catholic faith, yet his antecedent connexion with Arians was fatal to the legitimacy of his episcopate. On the other hand, "the Meletians," as they might be called, if the term had not been otherwise appropriated, were doubtless indignant at the "stiff obstinacy" of these "ultra-Catholics," and regarded them as narrow-minded sectarians, who were blind to the duty of uniting with a bishop of orthodox belief. The "Apostles' church" in the Old City was thus the stronghold and sanctuary of a large body of orthodox Antiochenes who, disowned by the Eustathians, and abjuring the Arian communion of Euzoius, were clinging with an ever-growing affection and reverence to a prelate who had suffered exile for disappointing the expectations of heretics. Could nothing be done—it might well be asked—to heal this division, which, if perpetuated, would be a standing disgrace and source of weakness to the Catholic cause throughout the East? It was resolved that the Eustathians, who were regarded as "in their rights," should be advised to offer their communion to the adherents of Meletius on the simple condition of the latter professing the Nicene faith and rejecting every heresy.

(2) Again, there was the great Western difficulty of the Ariminian Confession subscribed and accepted by so many bishops, who now bitterly regretted their weakness or their carelessness. How should they be treated? With what conditions should their request for reconciliation, their application for Catholic recognition and forgiveness, be met by those who had been loyal to Nicene

orthodoxy? The question included two difficulties. On the one hand, there was a risk of open schism if extreme measures should be taken against all these numerous bishops; on the other hand, there was great reason to think that they had, in many cases at least, been really deceived and beguiled into subscription, without fully appreciating the merits of the case: they had erred, in short, "in their simplicity." A rigorist view, although it found expression in the synod, was put aside, and the condition above mentioned was alone required from the persons in question.

(3) A third point was the question originating in the variations of language as to the term *Hypostasis*. The history of this celebrated term is curious. Socrates says that it was first used for an ambush, as under cover, or for the sediment of liquid, as the lees of wine at the bottom of a jar: it would thus come to be used for ground "under deep mire" (as in LXX. Ps. lxviii. 2), and metaphorically for whatever might serve as a support of physical life, as food (Wisd. xvi. 21) or goods (Deut. xi. 6). Then would follow applications of the word, still in view of the original import, to whatever might be a basis of confidence (2 Cor. ix. 4, xi. 17; Heb. iii. 14), or might give subjective reality to, and in that sense substantiate, things hoped for (Heb. xi. 1). Again, it might be used for being or essence, as the substratum of properties or attributes, with reference to man (Ps. xxxviii. 6) or to God (Heb. i. 3). And when thus introduced into the field of theology, the word might take a slight turn or extension of meaning to signify "being" in the sense of "personal" subsistence, as if to say, "There is a really existing Father, or Son, or Holy Spirit." Now the Nicene Council, in its "anathemas," had clearly employed "hypostasis" as equivalent to "Ousia," that is, essence or being, as the Council of Antioch in 269 had spoken of the Son as "in *ousia* and *hypostasis* God." In this sense, the Son was to be confessed as of "one hypostasis" with the Father. Athanasius himself represents this language, for the most part, although he occasionally favours the derived sense of "person" or "subsistence," which had been employed by some of the Alexandrian Ante-Nicenes, and had been, since the Nicene Council, coming into use among Arianizers—as in the Creed of the Dedication—and among those Churchmen who had been more or less connected with Semi-Arians, and who were specially anxious to exclude Sabellianism by insisting that the Son and the Holy Spirit were not mere "modes" of the existence of the Father. Among these men it was becoming usual to

speak of "Three Hypostases:" and how was this phrase to be dealt with, in regard to the claims, so to speak, of the phrase involved in the Nicene formula, which represented the Divine Hypostasis as "One"? Athanasius took the opportunity of going below phrases into ideas. He asked the maintainers of "Three Hypostases," "Do you mean three essences, three separate Beings, three Gods?" "Far be it from us; we mean simply to safeguard the true personal subsistence of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit." He turned to those who spoke of "One Hypostasis." "Do you mean anything like Sabellianism?" "Assuredly not; we use Hypostasis, as the Nicenes used it, for essence, and we mean to assert the co-essential Unity." These mutual explanations, so wisely and kindly elicited, were deemed satisfactory; but when the bishops went on to deprecate the use of either phrase (not, as Socrates strangely imagined, of the term Ousia), they forgot that the sense of Hypostasis in the Nicene anathemas could not but come into question, and that, according to the answer given, "three Hypostases," or "one Hypostasis," would be implicitly affirmed.

(4) Again, a tendency was now apparent among persons of unsuspected and even strongly pronounced orthodoxy on the great question of the time, towards a mode of thought and speech which explained away, or virtually nullified, the human side of the "mystery of godliness." Somewhat of this mistaken reverence was fostering a reluctance to admit that Christ, as man, was subject to human limitations, or, for instance, to attach a real import to the prayer of the Agony. But these were only the beginnings of a movement which was taking fuller form in a mind at once highly cultured and exceptionally versatile. Apollinaris of Laodicea, eagerly bent on carrying on the war with Arianizers, was unhappily led to minimise, if we may so say, the human element in the Incarnation, and, by way of safe-guarding the divine singleness of our Lord's personality, to exclude the *nous*, or mind, from His manhood. The Arian notion that the titular "divinity" of the created "Son" discharged in Christ the function of a *psyche*, or "animal soul," was ingeniously utilised, so to speak, by suggesting that the "rational soul" was, in Him, superseded by the presence of the Divine Logos. This was the first stage of that "Apollinarian" error which afterwards, as if in obedience to the downward-leading destiny of all non-Catholic speculations, proceeded to deny the human reality of Christ's body, and to regard it as a portion of

the Godhead "converted into flesh." This extremity, however, was not reached at the time when a growing disbelief in the reality of our Lord's human mind began to produce anxiety; and when, as it seems, those who were, or appeared to be, inclined towards it were disposed to suspect others of denying the true personal oneness of the as yet unincarnate Son with Him who was born of Mary —in other words, when they showed a fear of encouraging the form of thought afterwards known as Nestorianism. But we must pause a little longer over the first appearance of the original Apollinarianism. Its author did not merely assume that a manhood "complete," including a mind, would in effect involve a distinct human personality, whereas it was held on the other side that the Divine Son could adopt manhood into union with His own indivisible self; he further assumed that a human mind, being the seat of will, would involve the possibility of an evil choice, that is, of sin. This raised a vital question. Christ was sinless; but was He peccable? Granting that His human nature was free from any inherited taint, from what is called "original sin:" was He in the condition of man unfallen, capable at once of faithfulness and of revolt, and therefore open to the attractions which disobedience might offer? Was He, in this respect, dependent simply on His human resolution sustained by the Holy Spirit? In other words, was it possible for Him humanly, until the close of His human probation at death, to entertain the wish, not to say to form the purpose, to defy the known will of His Father? Unquestionably, an internal act of this kind would "involve a centre of independent personality in His human nature," distinct from, and capable of antagonism to, the personality of the Divine Son. So far Apollinaris was right; but he was wrong in supposing that, in order to avoid so destructive a consequence, it was necessary to eliminate the human mind from Christ's humanity, and thereby to accept other consequences not less disastrous, as the unreality of our Lord's language in the expression of human surprise, human disappointment, human anxiety, above all, human sympathy—and of that human will whereby He gave Himself up to death. This revived Docetism could not be required as a safeguard of His impeccability: for He, being one with the Son of God, could humanly desire this or that object, but could not will to obtain it by an act of moral rebellion. Apollinarianism itself seems to modern Christians so paradoxical that it is necessary thus to recognise the force of its appeal to Christian piety and loyalty.

(5) Lastly, there was a somewhat less pronounced tendency to an opposite form of error. Some had taken up phrases which implied that the relation between the Logos and the manhood of Christ was essentially the same as that which had existed when "the Word of the Lord came to" this or that prophet or other holy man. This was in effect the Photinian view, according to which the Word was impersonal; but in so far as it saw in Christ a distinct human person, it was a preparation for the Nestorian theory of an association between the Son of God and the Son of Mary, which, as we shall find, reduced the difference between Christ and the saints to a superiority of degree only, and thereby nullified the Incarnation as a veritable entrance of God into human life.

In regard to these two questions, some representatives of Apollinaris declared that he fully recognised the reality of a human soul and mind in the "Incarnate," and those who had been supposed to think of Christ as a signally favoured saint protested that they believed Him to be the very Son of God, who had become Son of man without prejudice to His Divinity.

It would also seem that the question of the Divinity of the Holy Spirit came in some form before the Council.

The Council transacted its business in a spirit of admirable fairness, patience, equity. A Tome, or synodal letter, was addressed to "those at Antioch," that is, to the Eustathians (whose pastor was represented by deacons), and to Lucifer, Eusebius, and three other prelates. It was evidently drafted by Athanasius, and, as we have described, bears the mark of his comprehensive theological insight, which could do justice to different sides of the same divine truth; and, not less clearly, of the loving earnestness which, pre-eminently at this anxious crisis, he showed for the great object referred to in the touching words, "If haply the Lord will pity us, and join together what has been divided, so that when there is again one flock, we may all have again one Guide!" It was natural indeed for the great champion of the Truth to be the great peacemaker among those who really agreed in receiving it. Eusebius added a Latin note of his own, by way of emphasizing his acceptance of all the resolutions of the Council on the question of the Hypostasis—on the assumption by the Incarnate Saviour, the Divine Son, of entire humanity, sin only excepted—and on the falsity of any so-called Sardican document which might seem to derogate from the position held by the Nicene Creed.

He quitted Alexandria, at the conclusion of the Council, in

order to bear its decrees to Antioch. What he found there was, to his inexpressible disappointment, simply an enlargement of the existing wound. The Council, distinctly regarding the Eustathians as properly *the* Antiochene Church, had exhorted them, indirectly, to stretch out the hand of fellowship to the Meletians, so called, on proof being given of the orthodoxy of the latter. How little could the good fathers have imagined that, before their deliberations were over, Lucifer had taken a step which was, in fact, to keep the two orthodox bodies apart for more than fifty years to come! It was his business, Rufinus implies, to promote the settlement of affairs under a bishop whom each party could recognise; but "in his impetuosity," his eager sympathy with "thorough-going persistence," and his intolerance of whatever had at any time been tainted by Arianizing connexions, he abandoned the task of a mediator in order to satisfy his feelings as a partisan. In conjunction, says Jerome in his Chronicle, with two other confessors, he laid his hands on Paulinus and consecrated him bishop. Well qualified as that good man was for the episcopate, to confer it on him in such circumstances was hopelessly to alienate the orthodox of the "Old City," and to turn a present discord into an abiding schism. "It was not right," says Theodoret with significant conciseness; "it did but protract the dissension"—which was not, in fact, really healed until the Eustathian remnant, as it then was, yielded at last to the peace-loving goodness of a bishop named Alexander, who had the joy of seeing the two bodies unite in worship in the year 415. Finding that Lucifer's hot-headedness had, as Tillemont observes, applied "a bad remedy" to the evils of the Antiochene church, Eusebius, in his vexation and distress, departed from Antioch, preserving his own communion with each of the two separated parties. Athanasius and the Egyptian church, although disapproving of the conduct of Lucifer in the consecration of Paulinus, and at first desiring to form relations with Meletius, ultimately retained their ecclesiastical fellowship with the Eustathians, as did the church of Cyprus and the whole of the West, whereas the Eastern orthodox were ardently attached to Meletius and that body—now the more numerous—which gloried in calling him its pastor. He himself, it appears, had not returned home when Paulinus received consecration: he arrived somewhat later, perhaps in September, 362. Meantime Lucifer, indignant at the dissatisfaction which his proceedings had excited, broke off communion with Eusebius; and

although he did not formally disavow the action of his deacons, who in his name had assented to the resolutions of the Alexandrian Council, he appears to have separated himself ecclesiastically from all the members of the Council itself.

Hence arose the rigid little sect of Luciferians, who reproduced in regard to doctrinal backsliding or weakness that unkindly and unevangelic rigorism which the Novatians exhibited towards the case of the lapsed; and whose "fall into the darkness of schism, through loss of the light of charity," is mentioned by St. Augustine as akin to the temper of the Donatists. For the bishop of Caliaris himself it may be pleaded that his cruel wrongs had done much to exasperate his temper: he had naturally, as it seems, a hard stern spirit, and in his exile he had accustomed himself to pour out the most vehement streams of passionate invective against the "idolatry" and "apostasy" of an Arian court, until, to adopt some famous words, the "fierce indignation which had lacerated his heart" destroyed in him all sobriety, forbearance, and consideration. The unbending confessor became, through want of charity and patience, first of all the furious declaimer, and then—when blamed by his own brethren, faithful and brave as himself, for hasty wrongheadedness and self-willed zeal—the revolter and the schismatic; a melancholy sample of deterioration, but surely instructive as to the need of balance and harmony in the character of those who would work in the cause of divine Truth, and as to the sterility of many endurances, many witnessings, many efforts, for lack of "the very bond of peace and of all virtues." Lucifer, the Catholic Confessor, tarnished his renown by a schism which his previous acerbity may go far to account for; he died out of the Catholic Communion eight years after he had quitted it. Jerome, wishing to speak of him kindly and respectfully, calls him "blessed;" but while rejecting the imputations of personal ill-temper or of morbid vaingloriousness, made against him by some churchmen with much confidence, is yet "constrained by truth" to say that Lucifer "did, in a great crisis of the Church's history, separate off a small number of sheep, and leave the rest of the flock to themselves." This "small number"—so small at that time, though larger afterwards, that Jerome says in the same dialogue "Against the Luciferians" that, if Christ's Church be confined to Sardinia, He has become poor indeed—was generally acknowledged to be free from heresy, and for that reason, as Augustine considers, was not treated of in the great work of

Epiphanius; but Theodoret speaks of Lucifer as having added some strange doctrines to those of the Church, possibly some speculations as to the origin of souls. These did not, practically, exercise much influence; they were soon, Theodoret says, forgotten. Though Lucifer himself did not rebaptize proselytes, yet the inevitable destiny of such a schism as he inaugurated might seem to have impelled the deacon Hilary, who had suffered for orthodoxy as Roman legate at Milan, and who followed Lucifer in his secession, to organize a little following of his own, which indeed, for want of priests and sacraments, "died with him,"—for, says Jerome in regard to this, "Ecclesia non est *quæ non habet sacerdotes*,"—but which, in contravention of Hilary's own former practice at Rome, ignored the baptism of heretics, and reproduced the old Cyprianic view with an acrimony which, as Jerome observes, was very un-Cyprianic. The stern bigotry of the Luciferians is exhibited in the Memorial of Marcellinus and Faustinus, presented, many years later, to Theodosius I. They speak of the Council of Alexandria as a certain number of "wearied confessors," who made concessions in defiance of prophetic and apostolic teaching; who allowed to bishops that had denied the Son of God, not only admission into the Church, but the possession of their forfeited dignity; "cloaking impiety under the name of peace, contaminating the whole body of Church-people with heresy," and entailing on their whole communion "confusion and ignominy and the most pernicious consequences," among which, according to their statement, oppression and persecution of Lucifer's adherents must be reckoned. It would appear from this document that Lucifer, and those who adopted his line, disbelieved in the sincerity of the professions made by so many bishops who had accepted the Ariminian formula: even as Lucifer himself, it is there said, on coming to Naples, indignantly denounced Zosimus, who had been intruded into the see of the faithful Maximus, and who professed to have since then "risen up from impiety."

It was a very different judgment that was formed, as we have seen, by the "Council of Confessors," and by the great lights of the Western Church, Eusebius of Vercellæ and Hilary of Poitiers. Marcellinus and Faustinus spoke of Hilary as having "shown favour to transgressors;" the truth being that his gentle, peace-loving nature, and his persuasive powers, were appropriately exercised in the task of unravelling for some bewildered minds the intricacies of Arian subtlety, and of encouraging others who

saw the error into which they had been drawn, frankly to confess it, and to return in sincerity of heart to the confession of the Homoousion. In this beautiful and inspiriting work, worthy of a Christian bishop whose own faith and steadfastness had been so illustriously proved, Eusebius found Hilary engaged, when he returned from Antioch to Italy, and Italy on his return, in Jerome's vivid language, "laid aside her mourning robes." Then, Jerome proceeds, "the bishops who had been entangled in the wiles of Ariminum, and, without intending it, been accounted heretics, came eagerly together, protesting by the Body of the Lord, and by every holy thing in the Church, that they had suspected nothing evil in the creed which they had made their own. 'We thought,' they said, 'that the sense agreed with the words: we never apprehended that in the Church of God, where simplicity and purity of confession dwell, one thing could be uttered by the lips, and another hidden in the heart.' . . . Much else," he adds, a little further on, "I pass over, which they uttered with tears, being ready to condemn their former subscription and all the blasphemies of the Arians." He says that, at least in some cases, it was attempted to substitute new bishops for these penitent or professedly penitent ones; but that the people, being attached to their old prelates, were nearly ready to stone or kill those who would depose them. And, as he further remarks, it would have been absurd for Eusebius and his brethren to hold no intercourse with this large body of prelates who in their real convictions and belief were not Arians, but whom a rigorous treatment might have goaded into becoming so. Hilary, no doubt, had much success in his policy of reconciliation and reunion: the melancholy language in which, writing about two years later, he speaks of his efforts as baffled and fruitless, must be connected with the special difficulties of the church of Milan, which then occupied his mind. Rufinus associates him with Eusebius as "irradiating" Italy, Illyricum, and Gaul; and we may doubtless apply to him also the same historian's beautiful description of Eusebius's activities in the work of a healer and a priest. Councils were held in Italy: Hilary gives us a synodal letter of Italian bishops to those in Illyricum, rejoicing in the restored unity of faith, announcing the detection of the Ariminian trickeries, and the formal abrogation, by general consent, of the Ariminian Council's decrees. Liberius wrote to the bishops of Italy a letter, of which the terse laconic opening might be thought to imply some recollection of his own case:

"Repentance effaces the fault of inexperience." He refers to a Council in Achaia, as having accepted the resolutions of Alexandria; and in this he is borne out by Athanasius, who, in a letter to a bishop named Rufinianus, mentions Councils as held with the same object in Greece, Spain, and Gaul. And as Athanasius desires Rufinianus not to blame the Alexandrian Council's lenity, Liberius announces that on the condition, "which some persons think too easy and lax," of simply accepting the Nicene Creed, any one deceived by Homœan astuteness may regain all "that he had lost."

Another Council was held, with the same results, in Macedonia, as St. Basil was informed by a letter from Athanasius; and Athanasius's statement, in the later summer months of 363, to the Catholic Emperor Jovian, implies the assembling of other Catholic Councils, evidently about this same time, in Dalmatia, Dacia, Pamphylia, Lycia, Pontus, Cappadocia, and several other districts. In these assemblies, all of which wrote letters to the archbishop of Alexandria, the mind of the several churches in regard to the question, so to speak, between Nicæa and Ariminum was emphatically attested. At Ariminum there were, said the Arian Auxentius, six hundred bishops present: this was a sample of Arian exaggeration—exaggeration which afterwards mounted to a higher figure; the Anomœan Philostorgius, who, of course, had no respect for the Council which confessed the Homoion, understates its numbers as erroneously. But, granting that it was, as indeed it was, a larger Council than the Nicene, the Church disowned it, acknowledged the Nicene as sacrosanct, and thus established the principle that no Council, however numerous, is exempt from the test of subsequent acceptance. Thus the authority of Ariminum, in the provinces represented by these various synods, was of no more account than that of the gatherings of the Semi-Arian or Macedonian party in the year which was signalised by this memorable Alexandrian Council—gatherings in which, as Sophronius complacently observed, the just mean was kept between the Westerns' Homoousion and the Anomoion of Aetius. These insignificant utterances counted for as much, and as little, as the acceptance of the Homoion by a great body of bishops, whose act the Church disowned as a weakness, if not a treason. Ariminum was as Seleucia, or Ancyra, or Antioch; Nicæa remained in its inalienable majesty. To Athanasius, and to thousands whose spirit was as his spirit, the ever-shifting forms of anti-Catholic thought, the

manifold ingenuities of Arian creed-making, were but, as he expresses it, plants destined to be rooted up. "But the word of the Lord, spoken by the Œcumenical Nicene Council, endureth for ever." And yet the prestige of Ariminum was tenacious of life; we find that when the Spanish Goths adopted Catholicism towards the close of the sixth century, it was found necessary to insist that all should "heartily reject and condemn" that Council.

In turning to the renewal of Donatist troubles in Western Africa, we may first recall the manner in which, after several years of tumult and resistance, the "Union" of all Christians in, or rather an outward conformity to, the Church, had been effected by means of Macarius and Paul. The Donatist bishops, except those who were content to join the Church, had been driven into exile. When Julian came to the throne, they addressed a singularly worded petition to him as to a prince whose actions were swayed by just principles only, or, as they expressed it, "with whom justice alone had a place." There was no wonder that the Catholics took advantage of such a phrase; but Augustine does them plain injustice by saying that it implied approbation of the Emperor's apostasy. They meant that he, standing outside the Christian body, could have no interest to bias him in favour of this or that party of Christians. In that view, they entreated him to recall them from exile, and restore to them their churches; and they alleged records of former legal investigations as bearing out their claim. Julian was ready enough to grant their petition. He replied by a rescript to the officials of Africa, in which, referring to this petition of "Rogatianus, Pontius, Cassianus, and the other bishops, and also clerics," he ordered that whatever had been unlawfully done against them should be annulled, and all things recalled to their former state. The result of this order was, of course, the return of the exiled prelates, among whom Pontius appears to have been the most active and pertinacious. "It was Pontius who did it," exclaims Augustine; "it was Pontius who drew up the petition, it was Pontius who called the Apostate 'most just.'" The restoration of this bishop and his colleagues was followed by a renewal of the violences and outrages of former times. Optatus exhausts his power of invective against the Donatists who "returned in frantic fury, subtle in misleading, pitiless in bloodshed, challenging the 'sons of peace to war.'" They drove out many Catholic prelates; they came with hired bands to attack churches—doubtless, in many cases, to resume possession of

churches from which they had formerly been expelled: we are told of Felix and Januarius, who entered a place called Castellum Lemellense, found the church closed, unroofed it, and killed two deacons who were defending the altar. In Mauritania two "firebrands," Donatist bishops both, assisted by the local authorities of Tipasa, drove out the Catholics with violence and bloodshed, in which women were not spared, and unborn infants perished: a bottle of chrism was flung out of a church window, and, as if to exhibit in the most audacious way the disbelief in the validity of Catholic ordinances, "they commanded the Eucharist to be thrown to the dogs." In various places they caused the church altars—which, as in the famous case of the outraged church at Alexandria, were evidently of wood—to be broken, scraped, and carried away, as if they had been defiled by contact with the Catholic Sacrament. The chalices, which, says Optatus, "had carried the Blood of Christ," were broken and melted down, and sold with every mark of insult. The very walls of the churches were washed, as unclean; the pavements were sprinkled with salt water; the linen coverings or "palls" of the altar, and the sacred books, were extorted from Catholic keeping by legal process; the cemeteries were closed against Catholics when dead. Church-virgins were compelled to put off their purple caps, and receive new ones from Donatist hands, in token of the nullity of their former dedication. The Donatists, says Tillemont, after seizing the churches with such violence, worked hard to fill them with apostates from Catholic unity. They went about saying, "Look to yourselves," "Redeem your souls," "Become Christians," "Why, So-and-so, are *you* still a pagan?" as if Catholics, or, as they would say, communicants with Traditors, had as such no real claim to be considered Christians at all, and needed to be baptized *de novo*. Those who came over to their communion were put under penances of unequal length, without any pretence of equitable or discriminating adjustment: "one man, at their bidding, did penance for a whole year, another for a month, another scarcely a whole day." "They extended their hands," as Optatus says with a reference to the usual form of absolution, "over members of all the four orders in the Church, bishops, presbyters, deacons, and faithful." "By putting the faithful to penance, by degrading presbyters and deacons into laymen, they 'overthrew souls.'" Several bishops are mentioned whom they degraded from the episcopate; one of these was a very aged man, a bishop of seventy years' standing, bearing the very common name of Donatus.

This bitter and factious spirit of the leaders infected the proselytes whom they gained; they were seriously lowered in moral tone, became "furious instead of patient, contentious instead of peaceable, insolent instead of modest, malignant instead of harmless," eager and vehement in drawing over their friends who still remained in their old communion. Such persons as declined to secede after their example were taunted with slowness and stupidity. "How long are you going to stay *there?*" was the frequent question of the proselytizing convert. Yet this intolerant and fierce-tempered sect, preserving carefully the forms of Church ritual, was wont to pray daily in its celebrations for "the One Church dispersed throughout the world!" This picture of Donatism rampant and triumphant was drawn by Optatus within a few years after the recall of Donatist exiles, and prepares us for the evidence furnished by St. Augustine of the prodigious force and vitality of a schism which to us appears so signally repulsive that we can hardly conceive of it as swaying the convictions of any truly Christian man.

CHAPTER XVIII.

AFTER THE PAGAN REACTION.

It was impossible for the Christian community not to watch with awful interest the fortunes of Julian's fatal campaign in the spring of 363. Many Christians persuaded themselves that he had threatened to signalise his expected triumphant return by "utterly destroying the very name of Christianity," or at any rate, to carry on the contest with Christianity in a more definite form and to a more satisfactory result. This interpretation of his purposes and hopes was also current among his own friends and supporters; and Libanius's famous question to the Christian "pedagogue" at Antioch was propounded in a mood of exultant confidence, when Julian's menaces against Christianity were filling his mind. "Well, what is the Carpenter's Son doing now?" "The Maker of the world," was the stern prompt answer, "He whom you scoffingly call the Carpenter's Son, is now at work on a coffin!" It was felt on both sides that on the issue of the Persian campaign depended in great measure the Church's prospects as to renewed tranquillity or overt persecution. If Julian should return flushed with victory, he would probably forget his former professions of supercilious tolerance, and act upon alleged later menaces (which, however, might be unauthentic, or exaggerated by report) of downright attack on the worshippers of the Crucified. But should his Eastern war be terminated by defeat or death, it was inconceivable that any one else would be able to reign on the basis of his anti-Christian policy. The suspense which had lasted for several months would be ended in one way or another, and the Church would know what lay before her—whether she must prepare for a new period of martyr-conflict, or might pour forth her thanksgivings for a great deliverance, and triumph in the vindication of her Master's outraged Name. For the Christian heart would be stirred with a yet deeper

interest by the consciousness that Julian had manifoldly set himself to defy not only the Church of Christ, but its divine Head, whom he usually spoke of as "the Dead Man." He had, in the winter of 362, spent the long nights in composing his work against Christianity, of which so many important passages are preserved in the reply of Cyril of Alexandria. Thus it would be felt that he was, more distinctly and consciously than any previous anti-Christian ruler, challenging to a trial of strength the Lord whom he had rejected, and prayer would often take the impatient form of *Usquequo Domine?* In this hush of high-wrought expectation it is touching to find, at least in the case of one illustrious Churchman, that Christian charity still followed, as it were, in the track of the abhorred and dreaded "apostate," pleading with Heaven for his conversion, as well as for the relief of the Church. This was Didymus, the blind scholar and teacher of Alexandria, whom the heathen historian calls by a name descriptive of his intense mental energy, and praises as memorable for writings in every branch of knowledge—who, as Socrates and Sozomen tell us, was eminent in all learning, grammar, rhetoric, philosophy in various departments, and competent on the shortest notice to enter on the gravest discussions. He had been consoled by Antony for "possessing the eyes of an angel, which might well compensate for the loss of bodily sight," and had become, in his office of Principal of the Catechetical School and elsewhere, a great champion of the Catholic faith, and a successful opponent of the Arians, whose sophisms, we are expressly told, he overthrew not merely by logical force, but more effectively by his persuasive fairness and candour. It was his happiness to retain a genial tenderness of heart amid lifelong blindness and protracted public anxieties; he "was sorely distressed," says Sozomen, "at the Emperor's offences against true religion, both on account of his having thus gone astray, and because of his contemptuous bearing towards the churches: he fasted and prayed to God on account of this." And it was, the story proceeds, while sleeping in a chair after these prolonged devotions that he, "as it were in an ecstasy, seemed to see white horses traversing the air, while the riders on them proclaimed, 'Announce to Didymus that this day, about this hour, Julian has been slain; let him signify this to Athanasius the bishop, and arise and take food.'" We cannot wonder that various reports were current as to mysterious intimations, received by various

persons in the Church, of the same or a like tenor; or that when the news of Julian's fate was actually received in Antioch, the Christians, for the moment, were carried away by the mere intensity of their exultation, "not only leaping for joy in the churches and at the shrines of martyrs, but even in the theatres proclaiming that the Cross had triumphed, and shouting with one voice," as in scorn of the impostor who had been the main agent in Julian's perversion, "Where are now thine oracles, O foolish Maximus? God and His Christ have conquered." Gregory, writing some months later, records his own instinctive outburst of triumph: "Where are now the sacrifices, and mysterious rites, and victims slain openly and in secret? where the much-praised art of divining from their entrails? where those gods that went before thee and with thee? where those oracles against Christians, and those threats of annihilating the Christian name? All gone—falsified—vanished away—the boastings of the impious are proved to be but a dream!" But a little further on he "laments the destruction of the impious," and would fain hope that pagans might be moved, by this great ruin of their plans, to forsake their errors and follow after the Truth; he warns his fellow-Christians, in their day of joy and amid their songs of deliverance, to profit by their recent chastening, to lay aside all thoughts of vengeance; not to drag the pagan oppressors before the tribunals, not to inflict on them what they had inflicted on the Church, but rather to soften them by the example of Christian forbearance; not to abuse the present opportunity by pressing hardly on those who in their turn were prostrate, but to show the difference between pagan and Christian teaching by a generous unreserved forgiveness, and to "magnify by kindness the mystery,"—the wonderful mercy which demanded such thanksgivings as would be most in harmony with the Charity of God.

The successor of the "Apostate" was Jovian, who is said to have manfully stood up for his Christian faith while yet a soldier in Julian's army, where, at his accession, he held the rank of First of the bodyguards. The announcement which Jovian made, when hailed as Emperor, to the effect that he was a Christian, could hardly have been followed, as Socrates and others tell us, by a declaration similar in purport proceeding from the whole body of soldiers; for Ammianus speaks of sacrifices and inspection of victims being made on behalf of the new sovereign, and it may well be that, in such a moment of agitation and at so perilous

a crisis, the usual pagan forms were gone through. Jovian is described by Ammianus as a man who possessed some claims to respect on the score of his father's services, was moderately well educated, but was given to sensual gratifications—a fault which, says the candid pagan, "perhaps he would have corrected from an Emperor's self-respect," and brief phrases of Ammianus do not justify Gwatkin's parallel between Jovian and such an infamous debauchee as Michael the Drunkard. Our Christian authorities dwell fondly on his piety and gentleness—two virtues admitted by Ammianus, who calls him "zealous for the Christian law," and on the whole of a kindly disposition, and likely to be careful in the choice of magistrates; but they also go so far beyond facts as to speak of him as "truly worthy of the sovereignty," and even as "distinguished for various high qualities," and somewhat unfairly throw the whole blame of that "ignominious treaty" which gave back five provinces to the Persians on what Gregory Nazianzen calls the "suicidal rashness" by which Julian had imperilled the army. Of Jovian's outward appearance we can form as vivid an image as of his predecessor; and the two men were, in this as in all points, contrasts to each other. Jovian was a man of almost gigantic stature: for some time, we are told, "no imperial garment could be found long enough to fit him;" he walked with a heavy step, casting keen glances around, and winning hearts by his cheery expression of countenance, and ready, even in public, to talk pleasantly with those nearest to him; altogether a frank, easy-going, straightforward soldier—commonplace evidently as to imperial qualifications, but one who, had he reigned longer than the few months allotted to him, might probably have commanded sincere attachment. He wrote, says Sozomen, "without delay to the provincial governors, ordering that the people should freely assemble in the churches;" he "restored to the churches and clergy, the widows and virgins, all their numerous immunities, and whatever had been granted for the benefit and honour of religion by Constantine and his sons, and taken away under Julian;" and by a special order to a prætorian prefect, he placed the church-virgins under the particular protection of the law. Nothing less could be expected from one who had never compromised his Christianity, and who marched westward with the Christian Labarum once more "displayed at the head of the legions."

But the question was asked on all hands, What line would the new Augustus take in regard to Arians and Catholics? We are

told that "the leaders of the various communions repaired to the Emperor, thinking themselves respectively sure of obtaining from him full license to speak against those whom they regarded as their opponents." There is a subtle sarcasm latent in the words of Socrates, which Gibbon takes pleasure in expanding into a picture of "Homoousian, Arian, Semi-Arian, Eunomian bishops, struggling to outstrip each other in the holy race" to Jovian's audience-chamber. According to Socrates, the "Macedonians" came in foremost, and presented a memorial denouncing the Anomœans. This was, in fact, a Semi-Arian deputation, led by Basil of Ancyra, Silvanus, and Sophronius; and according to Sozomen, their request was—Either let the decisions of Seleucia and Ariminum remain valid, or let the division which preceded those Councils be respected, so that the several parties may meet in distinct assemblies, where they will; but let not the partisan intriguers (*i.e.* the Acacians) who triumphed under Constantius be allowed to have their own way. But Socrates and Sozomen seem at issue on this matter: the former says that Basil and his companions appeared before the Emperor; the latter makes them say in their memorial that they have forborne to trouble him by repairing to his "camp"—a phrase often significantly applied, as in the Sardican canons, to the court of the "imperator" wherever situated—but that if he wished to see them, they would come at their own expense. Probably this may be reconciled by supposing that the deputies, Basil and the rest, spoke in the name of their absent brethren. But it is inconceivable that Semi-Arians could have requested that the Ariminian settlement should hold good: on this point Sozomen is evidently mistaken, for even if he is referring to the first proceedings of that Council, which included the deposition of Valens and Ursacius, those proceedings were distinctly Catholic, in opposition to all forms of Arianism. Jovian's answer, as given by Socrates, is as evidently genuine: "I hate contentiousness, and love and honour those who study unanimity." He had resolved, says Socrates a little further on, to "cut off contentiousness by a bland and persuasive demeanour." So too, when —if Philostorgius is correct—two Anomœan bishops, relations of his own, presented themselves even before he had reached Antioch, he preserved the same tone, and declined to commit himself. The Anomœans just now were in great need of internal unity, as well as of political countenance; for in Julian's reign, Eudoxius had indeed prevailed on Euzoius to take some steps for the restoration

of Aetius (whom the Acacians had used as a scapegoat)—according to Philostorgius he had even repeatedly voted for the elevation of that heresiarch to the episcopate, which actually took place at Constantinople; and Euzoius for his part had held a little synod, which reversed the sentence against Aetius; but the troubles of Julian's later months had prevented further action. Jovian's accession did indeed induce Euzoius to send the synodal letter to Eudoxius: Aetius and Eunomius thereupon sent Theophilus, surnamed "the Indian," to urge Euzoius to greater activity; but by the foolish resolution to consecrate, as Anomœan bishop of Constantinople, a person named Pœmenius, they alienated Eudoxius; and even a very extreme Anomœan bishop, Theodosius of Philadelphia—who had maintained that Christ was by nature morally mutable, but had by his complete practice of the virtues been lifted up into a fixed condition of goodness—himself declared against the consecration of Aetius, and allied himself with eight other prelates in a movement which Eudoxius gladly sanctioned, being wont, we are told, to sneer at Ultra-Arians as "high-flying" and impracticable.

So turbid and restless at this crisis was the little pool of extreme Arianism; while, as we have seen, the Semi-Arian party were calling for the ejection of all Ultra-Arians, and the establishment of the Seleucian Council's form of faith, or at least of the *status quo* before that Council. And what was the line of the Acacians? It was eminently characteristic of the shiftiness of their versatile chief. When Jovian had arrived in Antioch, in the October of 363—under menacing tokens, as the pagans thought, of the offended majesty of the gods whom he disowned—he showed great respect to the bishop Meletius: whereupon, as Socrates tells us, Acacius and his companions entered into a negotiation with the favoured prelate, and actually professed their acceptance of the Nicene Creed. They then united with him in a synod, and addressed a synodal letter to their "most religious sovereign, beloved of God, who, as they were aware, had rightly regarded the accurate representation of the orthodox faith as a main element of Christian unity." The term Homoousion in the Nicene Creed, says this document as given by Sozomen, was thought strange by certain persons; but it had been interpreted by the fathers in a sound sense, as signifying that the Son was "begotten from the Father's essence," and was "like in essence to the Father;" it involved no carnal conceptions of the divine Sonship,

nor was "essence" to be understood in the sense which it bore in Greek philosophy (*i.e.*, probably, in a materialistic sense): it was an effective barrier to Arius's impious assertion that the Son was "made out of what did not exist," and was, as such, yet more necessary than ever in presence of the audacities of Anomœanism. Accordingly, the writers of this letter informed the Emperor that they were not to be reckoned among the perverters of orthodoxy, but embraced and held the Creed of the holy Council of Nicæa; a copy of which was appended to their statement. This letter was signed with twenty-seven episcopal names, some of them being affixed by presbyters on behalf of their absent prelates. One may well suspect the sincerity of a person like Acacius, but among his party there may have been men who were sincerely persuaded that the old objections to the Nicene formula were grounded on misapprehension; and yet, with every disposition to put a good construction on this document, an observant Churchman would feel that when the matter in hand was to give assurance of a genuine acceptance of the Homoousion, the reference to a Nicene phrase which that term had been intended to elucidate and safeguard was spoilt for its purpose by the juxtaposition of another term which had long been used with an anti-Nicene intention, and which of itself suggested that there were two essences, one of them "like to" the other, but not the same, therefore not *both* Divine.

Whether Meletius was conscious of this or not, he could hardly expect that the suspicions of consistent Catholics would be allayed by what would seem an evasive adoption of their test-word; and we know what Paulinus must have thought of this new Antiochene declaration—perhaps we may ascribe to him an extant bitter attack upon it. But what of a greater than Paulinus? The Emperor had, indeed, shown favour to Meletius; but he had already opened communications with that one peerless representative of orthodoxy "who transcended all other bishops in virtue, and who had been so conspicuously persecuted in the cause of true religion." A letter of greeting from the Emperor to Athanasius had dwelt on his fearless contempt for suffering in behalf of the orthodox faith: "You counted as nothing all perils and menaces of death. Our Majesty therefore recalls you, and wills you to return for the purpose of teaching others the way of salvation. Come back to the holy churches, and act as shepherd of the people of God, and send up earnestly to Him your prayers in behalf of our Clemency. For we know that by your supplications we and all the Christians

who are with us shall receive great assistance from the Most High." Athanasius had already returned to Alexandria: the story of Sozomen, that after Julian's accession he suddenly appeared in his church, evidently fits in better with the circumstances of 363. From Gregory's account it would appear that he received a second letter from Jovian, requesting him to send a statement of the true faith: by a sure instinct, the plain blunt soldier had discerned his right guide, and determined to believe with Athanasius, who, in reply, presented to him what Gregory calls "a truly royal and majestic gift," the "Epistle," as it is called, "to Jovian on Faith," which was framed in a Synod, including the most learned of the Egyptian bishops. The substance of it is as follows: "A religious Emperor does well to be desirous of heavenly lore; and we, after giving God thanks for this evidence of your piety, have thought it best to remind you of the Nicene faith. This is the true faith, as it may be known and read out of the Divine Scriptures. For in this faith did the holy martyrs die, who, being released from the body, are now with the Lord; and it would have remained uninjured for ever, had not the wickedness of some heretics ventured to falsify it, by describing the Son of God as made out of nothing, a creature, and morally subject to change. Many were deceived, even among those who were in high repute, by these representations, notwithstanding the warnings of the Nicene Council. Now, some are trying verbally to admit this creed, but to explain away the force of its central term Homoousion; and these men, too, blaspheme the Holy Spirit, by calling Him a creature made by the Son. But this Nicene faith is the original Christian faith, and is now confessed by a vast number of different Churches,"—here Athanasius enumerates twenty, besides those of Egypt and "the East;" among the Western Churches he expressly mentions "all Italy," and Britain together with Spain and Gaul. "There are exceptions," he admits, but he describes these adherents of Arianism as "few"—a representation which, if strictly taken, must be called a serious understatement; and he appeals to the written letters of the great majority of Churches, then in the archives of the Alexandrian Church. The letter then recites the Nicene Creed, and urges that all must needs adhere to this faith, as "apostolic and divine"—all "subtleties and verbal arguments" being laid aside. After repeating the main points of the old Arianism, excluded by the Nicene anathemas, Athanasius remarks that the formula of "Like" was not used by the Nicene fathers, because it

did not express the full truth that the Son was "Very God from God;" and the formula of "Homoousion" was adopted, because it expressed the truth that He was "genuine and true Son of One who was true and essential Father." "Nor," he concludes—inferring the one remaining point from the brief Nicene reference to the Holy Spirit—"did the Nicene fathers separate the Spirit from the Father and the Son; on the contrary, they glorified Him with the Father and the Son in the one faith of the Holy Trinity, because in the Holy Trinity there is but one Godhead"—alluding, no doubt, to the wording which placed "belief in" the Holy Spirit along with "belief in" the Father and the Son.

Such was the synodal letter which, in the September of 363, was brought by Athanasius in person; he was graciously welcomed, and under the influence of his presence Jovian repeatedly, and with not a little of humorous bluffness and occasional irritability, repelled the pertinacious importunities of Lucius and some other Arians of Alexandria, who endeavoured to detach him from Athanasius by representing the archbishop as a man of demonstrably evil character—intolerant also, tyrannical, and insincere. There was no one, said they at one point of these strange conferences, who would join with him in worship; at another, they admitted that he spoke well, but accused him of dissimulation; they complained of him for denouncing them as heretics, and for taking from them the ecclesiastical property. There needed not, it would seem, the warning which some of the people, especially a soldier, thought it right to give the Emperor as to the true character of these memorialists, "the remnant of the party of that wicked George;" it was plain from the outset that Jovian could hardly listen to them with patience: he relieved his feeling of disgust by sharp retorts, and also, once by spurring his horse and riding on into the country, once by saying in his native Latin, "Strike! Strike!" and once, when Lucius craved a hearing, by an impatient curse on those who had sailed with him and had not flung him overboard. But he did not, even in his irritation, trench on the maxims of toleration which he consistently observed in his public conduct: "Who hinders you," he asked, "from meeting for worship?" The request for another bishop—"any one rather than Athanasius"—was contemptuously refused; and Lucius and his friends returned home in disappointment. It may here be observed that Sozomen is mistaken in thinking that Euzoius wished to promote an Arian eunuch named Probatius to the Alexandrian see:

Probatius was, indeed, enlisted in the interests of Lucius through Euzoius, but was punished with torture for lending himself to the Arian intrigue. Jovian further showed his favour to the orthodox of Antioch by placing them in possession of a new-built church.

Beside the proper business which had brought him to Antioch, Athanasius had some part to take in the very delicate and perplexing question between Meletius and Paulinus. Seventeen years before he had worshipped with the Eustathians; and he must have felt that they, under the guidance of Paulinus, had borne the burden of the day with unflinching firmness. But from the language of Epiphanius and Basil, combined with what we know of Lucifer's self-willed conduct, it appears that there were, on the other hand, grave difficulties in the way of his continuing to countenance his ancient friends, now that their pastor had become a claimant for the position of bishop of Antioch. As far as we can put together the various indications into an intelligible narrative, Athanasius came to Antioch with a disposition not to recognise this claim on the part of Paulinus, but rather to admit it on the part of Meletius. He would feel, probably, that the Eustathians, in so far as they had consented to Lucifer's act, had put themselves in the wrong, and had no right to expect his support. The Alexandrian Council had marked out a scheme for the reconciliation of the two parties: that scheme had been traversed by Paulinus's consecration. The Council regarded Meletius, his Arian consecration notwithstanding, as validly a bishop, and also, on the ground of his inaugural sermon, as essentially orthodox; his position was thus recognised before Paulinus received the laying-on of Lucifer's hands: on the whole, therefore, he was to be preferred to Paulinus, in the matter of the claim to the Antiochene prelacy. Thus we can understand Basil's assertion, that Athanasius was "altogether desirous of entering into communion with Meletius;" and he had a further reason for holding aloof from Paulinus, in that the latter was represented to him as having tendencies to Sabellianism, and to that imperfect recognition of Christ's perfect manhood which was forming itself into Apollinarianism. But, on the one hand, Meletius permitted himself to show some coldness in regard to the desired union with Athanasius; unfriendly counsellors put obstacles in the way; and in spite of the wishes of the Alexandrian primate, nothing was actually arranged. On the other hand, it is more than probable that Athanasius himself was dissatisfied at the co-operation of Meletius with Acacius in the recent Antiochene Council; and it is

certain that his misgivings as to the orthodoxy of Paulinus were removed by a statement of belief drawn up by Athanasius with his own hand, presented by him, as a test, to the Eustathian bishop, and thereupon formally accepted. "I Paulinus," the document began, "thus think, as I received from the fathers; that a perfect Father exists and subsists, a perfect Son subsists, a perfect Holy Spirit subsists," which is precisely what those meant to affirm who spoke of Three Hypostases. He accepts the language of the Alexandrian Council in regard to the term "hypostasis;" he believes that in the Incarnation the Word was made flesh for us, of the Virgin Mary and the Holy Spirit, without any change in His Godhead, and that His Body was not destitute of soul, of perception, or of "mind." He anathematizes the rejecters of the Nicene faith, the asserters of the new theory which regarded the Holy Spirit as a creature, the heresies of Sabellius and Photinus, and any others; and declares himself to keep the line of Nicene faith, and of the statements above written. Under these circumstances—having failed to meet with any response from Meletius, and having succeeded in obtaining this full evidence of orthodox fidelity from Paulinus—Athanasius saw no other course open to him than that of recognising Paulinus and the Eustathians as the legitimate bishop and true Church of Antioch; and on his return, as it appears, to Alexandria, he wrote a letter to Paulinus in that capacity—a letter which was long exhibited with triumph by the Eustathians, although, if we may rely on Basil's information, the circumstances which had led Athanasius to write it were not always fully stated or understood.

Athanasius, on his return home (February 19, 364), while he reviewed the events which had occurred since Julian's death, would cherish many a bright hope of peaceful days for the Church under the sway of an honest and kindly prince who had definitely espoused the side of the Catholic faith, but had as plainly adopted a policy of general toleration. To this the pagan orator Themistius alludes when, as deputed by the senate of Constantinople to "express their loyal devotion" to Jovian at Ancyra at the opening of the new year 364, he not only dwelt on the impossibility of coercing opinion on religious matters, but says that the Emperor has established religious freedom by a "law." Such a policy ought, in all fairness, to procure some respectful consideration for the memory of an Emperor who, however devoid of brilliant qualities, at all events demonstrated the compatibility of orthodoxy with fair-mindedness, on that throne which, but a few years back, had been the seat of a

heretic and a persecutor in one. But the young Augustus, who was only in his thirty-third year, died from sleeping in a damp bedroom, after a reign of less than eight months, on the 17th of February, 364. He was succeeded, after ten days of interregnum, by one who resembled him in military antecedents and stateliness of outward bearing, and greatly excelled him in vigour and energy. But while Valentinian I. might in two other respects be compared with Jovian, in that "under the reign of an apostate he had signalised his zeal for Christianity," and that as a sovereign he was consistently tolerant of all forms of worship, proscribing only "those secret and criminal practices which abused the name of religion for the dark purposes of vice and disorder," he was nevertheless one of those whose lack of self-control on one critical point has brought scandal on the faith which they held. Valentinian's besetting fault was a temper not only irritable, but on slight provocation apt to become savage. At first he took some pains to curb it, but ere long it broke through all restraints, and showed its tremendous energy, as in our own early Plantagenets, by outbreaks which changed his voice, his countenance, his bearing—and in judicial proceedings by the infliction of intense and protracted torture. An ingrained Illyrian hardness was in him enhanced by a jealousy of conspicuous abilities, wealth, or even learning: he was said even to have disliked men who were well dressed, and, although wont to call timid people "filthy," he himself became a prey to ignoble suspicions and irrational fears, which occasioned the death of not a few persons, including a lad of noble family, on the charge of dealing in magic. Personally Valentinian was blameless in one momentous particular, "strictly pure in life whether at home or abroad:" he disliked vulgar profuseness at table; he had a conscience awake to the duty of sparing the overtaxed provincials and of appointing trustworthy officials, although, if he heard that any of them were pitiless, he would say he had "found a Lycurgus or a Cato;" and he showed a certain vulgarity of mind by grasping at gain in disregard of justice. The grim story of his pet she-bears, "Bit of Gold" and "Innocence," brought home to the popular mind, perhaps with some exaggeration, the idea of his cruel disposition. The heathen historian, after summing up his character, praises him for having "stood midway between different forms of religion,"—meaning, of course, in his public action as Emperor. "He never disturbed any one on this head, nor commanded that this or that should be observed in religious worship;

nor did he, by threatening prohibitions, bend the necks of his subjects towards that which he himself observed, but left that whole side of life, as he found it, undisturbed."

The accession of Valentinian forms a great epoch in the later history of the empire; for he, by a virtual concession to the demands of his troops, established once again the principle of a divided sovereignty, which, except for two short periods in the reigns of his son and of Theodosius I., was thenceforward accepted and carried into effect under all the sovereigns who still bore the Roman name, until the deposition of Romulus Augustulus in 476. East and West became, in one sense, two dominions; and Valentinian, in disregard of a bold and faithful warning, committed the grave mistake of entrusting the East to the unworthy hands of his younger brother Valens, a man who, although not wholly destitute of merits, being firm in his friendships, and capable of showing a kindly consideration for his people when burdened by heavy taxation, was grossly deficient in mental culture, pitiably dependent on advisers who dictated his conduct, and ready at any moment, especially when his timorous anxieties were awakened, to emulate his brother's ferocity, to "keep the word 'death' on the tip of his tongue," and to press for the extremest inflictions on men whose guilt was but suspected or inferred. Ammianus, after describing his cruelties toward persons suspected of using occult arts—especially in order to ascertain the name of his successor—exclaims in an impassioned paragraph that if Valens had received any "instruction," he would have avoided the enormities into which his ignorance and his fears combined to betray him. We shall soon see the line of policy which he adopted in matters ecclesiastical: for the present let us follow Valentinian into the West, where the central scene of Church history for the year 364 is laid at Milan, and the central figure in it is Hilary.

The capital of Northern Italy had seen, within the past sixty years, much that was momentous for the interests of Christianity—the solemn legal establishment of equality of rights for professors of all religions, the visit of Athanasius to Constans shortly before the Sardican Council, the condemnation of Photinus, the rejection of the Semi-Arian "Macrostich," but also the triumph of an Arianizing tyrant over the conscience and steadfastness of a great episcopal assembly. And now the throne of this great church, but lately occupied by that "metropolitan of Italy" Dionysius, whom Athanasius, in spite of his momentary weakness which indeed was

soon repented of, calls a glorious confessor—this throne was, as it had been ever since Dionysius's banishment, occupied by Auxentius, a Cappadocian, who had been condemned in the first session of the Ariminian Council, and who possessed in ample measure the resourceful and diplomatic promptitude which distinguished several of the Arianizing chiefs. He was regarded with repugnance and distrust by the more intelligent churchmen in spite of his professions of orthodoxy; but Hilary, successful as he had been elsewhere in restoring Church unity on the basis of the Nicene faith, found on his arrival at Milan late in 364, that he had a specially difficult task before him. He set himself energetically to consolidate a Catholic opposition to Auxentius (who, as Dr. Cazenove has said in his "Life of Hilary," was indeed a "peculiarly treacherous and aggravating specimen of Arian"), and to organize meetings of hearty Catholics for worship, outside the churches of the city. In this state of things Valentinian came to Milan, in the summer of 364. Impatient of all religious dissensions, and studious, like Constantine, of religious as well as civil union among his subjects, the Emperor put forth an edict which, as Hilary says, while professedly aiming at the establishment of peace, seriously disturbed the church of Milan. He ordered, it seems, that the two parties should again meet in the churches, under the episcopal rule of the existing bishop. Hilary stimulated the Catholics to resistance, and at the risk of being thought an importunate meddler, and without considering whether unrestrained invective was likely to serve the cause that he had at heart, he presented a memorial to the Emperor, to the effect that Auxentius was "a blasphemer and an enemy of Christ," and did in fact believe far otherwise than the Emperor and everybody else supposed him to do. Valentinian was moved by this declaration, and ordered Hilary and Auxentius, with about ten other bishops, to hold a conference in presence of the "Quæstor" (whose function was to draft the imperial edicts) and the "Master of the Offices" (or chief of the civil administration). Auxentius began by challenging his accuser. "This Hilary," he said, "is not to be regarded as a bishop: he was condemned by Saturninus of Arles." The objection was overruled, and it was ordered that the question of doctrine should be discussed. Embarrassed by this requirement, Auxentius professed his belief in the true Godhead of Christ, and His oneness in Godhead and substance with the Father. "Let this statement," said the presiding officials, "be written down." Hilary also at once presented to

the Quæstor, for the Emperor, a memorial or "libellus," recording what had passed on this matter. It was next resolved that Auxentius, having written down his own declaration of belief, should read it in a public assembly. This he managed to evade, but presented to Valentinian a memorial to the following effect: "I do not see why the resolutions of six hundred bishops at Ariminum should be reconsidered at the urgency of men like Hilary and Eusebius, who were deposed from the episcopate, as records prove, ten years ago. Some of the people, who have all along held aloof from the communion of their bishops, have been stirred up by these men to a yet bitterer hostility, and the recent conference has been the result. In that conference I told the imperial delegates that I never knew Arius, never saw him, never knew what he taught. I hold what I learned from my earliest childhood—the belief in one only true God the Father Almighty, and in the true Son, God born of the true God the Father before all ages and before every beginning, and in His creative agency and earthly life, death, resurrection, ascension, session in heaven, and future return to judgment: also in the Holy Spirit, sent by our Lord God and Saviour to His disciples. I never spoke of two Gods: I know that there is but one God, and one Son from one Father, God from God. I condemn every heresy, and especially what was condemned by the Ariminian Council, an account of whose acts I send herewith, and pray your Serenity to order it to be read." This statement satisfied the government officials: the rumour was rapidly disseminated among the people, that Auxentius had made a very orthodox profession of faith, and was, after all, agreed in faith with Hilary; and ultimately Valentinian himself came publicly to the cathedral, and received Communion from the bishop. Hilary, of course, was indignant: "It is a mystery of iniquity! Auxentius has deceived the Emperor: he has mocked both God and man." Valentinian was not likely to tolerate further inroads upon "peace;" and an imperial order compelled Hilary to leave Milan. He discharged his conscience under these discouraging circumstances by writing a fiercely polemical pamphlet against Auxentius, in which, after dwelling on the Arian misuse of Scripture language, he criticized severely the Arian bishop's statement, and scornfully threw aside, in the first instance, its appeal to the authority of Ariminum. That synod had been deprived of all authority by the subsequent expression of the Church's deliberate mind: its creed was a document framed at

Nicè in Thrace, imposed by force on reluctant Western bishops. What more need be said? Then, Auxentius had dealt in carefully phrased ambiguities as to the "true" Sonship or "true" Godhead of the Son; but his context showed that, in fact, he thought of the Father as alone "true God." After referring to some points in the Ariminian Creed, particularly the "Like to the Father according to the Scriptures," Hilary accused Auxentius of using the term "God" in regard to the Son, and other terms such as "Only-begotten" and "born before time," in senses compatible with Arianism. "To me," he proceeded, "that man is Antichrist, who does not confess the Son to be of one Godhead with the Father; and who does not in *such sort* affirm the Father to be the one true God, as to recognise also true Godhead in the Son." And finally, in a fervid address to those whom he could only reach by writing, on account of his enforced departure from Milan, he warns them to beware of Antichrist. "'Tis an evil love of walls that has taken hold of you: in an evil hour do ye revere God's Church as consisting of buildings, and under their shelter talk complacently of peace! Do you not know that it is in these places that Antichrist is to take his seat? To me, far safer are hills, and woods, and lakes, and prisons, and gullies: for there prophets have prophesied. Hold aloof, therefore, from Auxentius as an angel of Satan, a foe of Christ, whose professions to the Emperor were deceitful, whose deceits involved mere blasphemy."

And so Hilary of Poitiers disappears from the general field of Church life. He lived for some three years longer; if, as Sulpicius says, he died in the sixth year after his return, which would take place about the end of 360 or the beginning of 361, his life could not extend beyond 367, and probably his last literary work was the lost book "Against Ursacius and Valens." But his last act as a general Church leader was this stormy protest against the success of heretical astuteness, and the failure of his struggles for the Nicene faith in the second city of Italy. Yet his work on the whole was no failure: it could truly be said of him, as in the Parisian Breviary collect for January 14, that he "preserved throughout all the Gauls the faith of the Consubstantial Word."

If we can believe the account given by Sozomen, the Emperor Valentinian had already been appealed to by some of the Eastern bishops in the reviving contest between Catholicity and Arianism. On his journey westward in the spring of 364, he was asked by some prelates of the Hellespontine and Bithynian churches to

permit them to meet in council: he answered their delegate Hypatian of Heraclea, "For me, who rank as a layman, it is unlawful to meddle in such matters; but let the bishops, whose affair it is, meet by themselves wherever they will." Sozomen proceeds to say that the bishops, on receiving this message, assembled at Lampsacus, and, after a two months' session, annulled the Ariminian settlement as tainted by fraud, and affirmed the Homoiousion, insisting that the prelates deposed by the Anomœans should resume their own sees, as having been ejected contrary to law. He adds that the Lampsacene Council circulated its decrees, and sent deputies to the Eastern Emperor, to inform him of their proceedings, and to anticipate the exercise of the influence of Eudoxius; that these deputies found him at Heraclea in Thrace, where he was staying for the time, on his return eastward from parting with his brother; that Eudoxius had been beforehand with them, and had so prejudiced the mind of Valens, that after finding it vain to exhort them to keep on good terms with Eudoxius, he condemned them to exile, assigned their churches to the partisans of Eudoxius, and passed onwards into Syria. Socrates's account is very much shorter: he says that the Macedonians asked Valens, not Valentinian, for leave to hold a synod; that Valens, imagining them to agree with Eudoxius and Acacius (Acacius, be it observed in passing, who had but lately professed to accept the Homoousion), permitted them to do so, and then proceeded to Antioch; and that they accordingly met at Lampsacus in 365, seven years (by a lax reckoning) after the Council of Seleucia, condemned the Ariminian settlement and the Acacian and Eudoxian party, and, as a civil war (of which more presently) was then engaging public attention, were able by this synodal action to strengthen Macedonianism, and bring its theory into prominence. The account of Socrates seems decidedly preferable to that of Sozomen. It was hardly likely that Eastern bishops should request license for assembling not from their own sovereign, but from the Western Emperor; and as it is certain that Valentinian and Valens travelled westwards, not in 365, but in 364, while the civil war did not begin until the end of September, 365, Socrates's arrangement of events seems in two respects more probable than Sozomen's,—as to the sovereign whose license was asked, and as to the time of meeting of the Council. We may therefore suppose that the speech ascribed by Sozomen to Valentinian must have been uttered, if at all, in different circumstances; and it must have been at the close of 364, just when

Valens had returned to Constantinople, after parting from his brother at Sirmium, in July, that the Semi-Arians, now also called Macedonians, besought his permission to hold a synod. He was, indeed, even at that time decidedly biassed in favour of the real Arian party, although it was not until 367 that he received baptism from their chief Eudoxius. It is conceivable, to be sure, that he was but imperfectly informed as to the various schools or sects of Arianism, and so might be willing to grant his license to an important number of bishops without thinking it necessary to consult Eudoxius on the matter, and that thus the Semi-Arian Council met at Lampsacus, probably at the beginning of 365. It reaffirmed the position taken up by previous Semi-Arian assemblies at Ancyra and Seleucia, severely condemned the Ariminian formulary, and annulled the sentences passed by Acacians or by Anomœans against Semi-Arians in 360; but it also declared that any of its members against whom charges had been brought should be open to trial in a regular way before the neighbouring "orthodox" bishops,—the accusers, as usual, incurring, on failure to prove their case, the penalties which the charges, if established, would have involved. The Council sat probably for two months, and then its members dispersed under the complacent persuasion that they had consolidated the "Homoiousian" position, and struck a telling blow against the party which had triumphed under Constantius. But they did not foresee the impression which such stringent dealing would produce upon Valens. He was on his way through Asia Minor to Antioch when the Lampsacene deputies sought a hearing. He at once commanded them to profess agreement with Eudoxius: they of course refused, for their very aim was to counteract that prelate's tactics; perhaps they even ventured to point out the insincerity of his disavowal of Anomœanism at the end of 359. Valens replied by a sentence of exile: he summoned a meeting of Eudoxius's adherents, and ordered Eleusius, bishop of Cyzicus, a prominent Semi-Arian, to attend. Eleusius was commanded to concur in faith with the prelates assembled; after some resistance, he yielded to threats of exile and confiscation of his property. But no sooner had he returned home than his conscience smote him for his weakness, and he made public confession of his lapse before his people assembled in church: "I am unworthy to be your bishop any longer; choose for yourselves another in my place." The Cyzicenes would not hear of it: Eleusius had endeared himself to them, and they constrained him to continue at his post.

It was at this time that Valens began definitely to persecute the Catholics. He sent Meletius of Antioch into exile; but, to his credit, as well as to that of Paulinus, the bishop of the Eustathians was left undisturbed. He struck, however, with special directness at the representative and natural leader of all "Nicenes." A fragmentary Egyptian chronicle says that Athanasius, in 365, was attacked on the ground of many accusations; and on the 5th of May an imperial order was sent to Alexandria, commanding the ejection of Athanasius under penalty of a large fine to be laid on the civic authorities. The Church-people assembled in the Cæsarean church, and remonstrated so resolutely against this order, that the magistrates, fearing a tumult, consented to refer the case to the Emperor's further consideration. But this concession was only obtained after a month's agitation; and from the end of the first week of June several months passed over quietly. Then, on the evening of October 6, Athanasius, doubtless forewarned of danger, left his abode in the precinct of the Dionysian church, and took refuge in a country house near a cutting of the Nile called the New River—for which, as the story grew, was substituted "the tomb of his family." The flight was not an hour too soon. Thinking to seize their prey while the people were asleep, the prefect Flavian, and the "dux" or commanding officer Victorinus, came that very night to the church, broke open the outer gate, entered the "atrium," and reached the upper rooms where the bishop usually lodged. He remained in hiding, says the chronicler, until the 1st of February, 366, when an imperial emissary called Barasides or Bresidas arrived with a letter from Valens. It was read publicly before the prefect and the "dux," and was found to contain an order for the restoration of Athanasius. No time was lost about obedience to this new mandate; on the same day, attended by the municipal authorities or "curiales" and a multitude of the Christian inhabitants, Barasides formally reinstalled the bishop in the church of Dionysius, and so put an end to the last of five absences from his people, nearly thirty-one years after that enforced journey to Tyre which led to his first banishment. If we ask why Valens thus altered his policy, the answer is probably to be found in a natural apprehension of something like insurrection on the part of the Athanasians, combined with the fact that his attention was absorbed by the formidable revolt of Procopius, Julian's kinsman, whom a sensational but fictitious story asserted to have been secretly and solemnly designated by Julian as his successor. This

adventurer, after maturing his plans during the absence of Valens from Constantinople, suddenly appeared there at the new baths of Anastasia, hastily arrayed in a gold-embroidered tunic, holding a bit of purple cloth in one hand, but betraying his anxiety as to the result in the pallor of his downcast face, in the quivering of his limbs, and in the extreme difficulty with which he uttered,—as Ammianus describes it, with "a faltering and dying voice,"—a few words to the soldiers, who answered by the shout of "Procopius Emperor!" The movement was not without elements of strength: Procopius, weak-kneed as he was, might be called the heir of the Constantinian house, and would be regarded by the pagans as their natural representative; and the ignoble sovereign of the East was then involved in all the odium of which his father-in-law and minister Petronius had by pitiless exactions made himself the object, in regard to the many poor and noble houses which were "closed," says Ammianus, by his rapacity. Valens had heard of the rebellion in the autumn of 365, while staying at Cæsarea in Cappadocia, where his attempts to disturb the Church were resisted by the bishop Eusebius, with the assistance of the future bishop Basil, who, although he had reason to complain of Eusebius, came from his retreat expressly to support him in this emergency. Easily scared by any peril, Valens was at first disposed to "throw aside the imperial attire as a heavy burden," and although restrained by his friends from "so unworthy a step," and induced to return westwards, was discouraged by the failure of his attempt to take Chalcedon, incensed by being taunted from its walls as an "Illyrian beer-drinker," and obliged to see Bithynia pass under the dominion of Procopius. In this unhopeful state he spent the main part of 366; and it was not until the end of May in 367 that the betrayal of Procopius into his hands delivered him from anxiety. The pretender was instantly beheaded by his order: the story told by Socrates, as to the hideous mode of death devised for him by the cruelty of Valens, is refuted by the statement of Ammianus.

Valens was now free to turn his thoughts again to internal and ecclesiastical affairs; and the persecution which he had begun in the preceding year, and which the revolt had suspended, was resumed under the auspices of Eudoxius. It was at this time, probably, if not in the year preceding, that he expelled from Constantinople the congregation of Catholics, and closed the four churches belonging to the Novatians, who, as holding the Nicene faith were not less obnoxious to the Arians. Their bishop Agelius,

who led a life of austere simplicity, walking barefoot and using but one scanty coat, was also sentenced to exile. But these severities towards the sect whose members had, by recent troubles, been drawn nearer to the Church, were presently abandoned out of respect for a Novatian priest—afterwards a bishop—named Marcian, who had once, before his ordination, held a post at court, and was now a teacher of grammar to the daughters of Valens. For his sake, and doubtless at his urgency, the Novatian churches were again opened. But the dominant Arian party continued to make the Novatians feel their enmity.

It was in the deep distress and perplexity inseparable from such a time that the Semi-Arians, whose hopes as to the result of their Council had been rudely interrupted, and who saw themselves marked out, equally with the Catholics, as objects of Arian persecution, held various consultative meetings, at Smyrna, in Pisidia, in Pamphylia, and elsewhere in Asia Minor, the result of which was a resolution to abandon their objections to the Nicene formula, and to follow therein the example of Meletius. What help could they hope for save in the protection of the Catholic West—of Valentinian and of Liberius? They resolved, says Sozomen, to write to "the Roman bishop, and to the bishops in the West, as to men holding a firm faith received from the Apostles, and being pre-eminently bound to take forethought for religion." They accordingly deputed three bishops, Eustathius of Sebaste, Silvanus of Tarsus, and Theophilus of Castabala, to visit the West, and to present to its Emperor and chief prelates the assurance of their acceptance of the Homoousion. These deputies were instructed not to express any dissent from Liberius in point of doctrine, but to sign the Nicene Creed, and communicate with the Roman Church. On arriving in Italy, they found that they could not see Valentinian, who was then in Gaul, and principally at Reims; but Liberius, who was still in the Roman chair, although drawing very near to the end of his episcopate, received them, and read the letters which they brought. It was nine years since he had dishonoured his high place by compliance with the Arianizing party for the sake of regaining his home and see—a lapse repaired by subsequent faithfulness. He was, at first, entirely indisposed to trust or welcome his visitors: he bluntly told them that they were Arians. They answered, if Socrates was correctly informed, by assuring him that they had repented of their errors—that they had already "denied" Anomœanism, and had confessed the Son

to be "like in all things to the Father," which confession, they said, was nowise different from that of the Homoousion. If this was so, they apparently meant, "The 'entire likeness,' which covers Homoiousion, amounts, in our apprehension, to Homoousion." This was, in effect, to repeat the evasion resorted to at Antioch in 363, and Liberius was by no means satisfied; for indeed he had reason to be cautious in such a business, and yet more so if he had known that Eustathius, though a professed Semi-Arian, had twice accepted the Ariminian creed. He required from his visitors a written statement of their belief; whereupon they drew up and presented to their "lord, brother, and fellow-minister Liberius," a document, in which they informed him that, as representing the mind of the bishops who had met at Lampsacus, at Smyrna, and elsewhere, they desired to profess to him, and to all the Italian and Western bishops, their acceptance of the Creed of the 318 bishops of the holy Nicene Council, in which "the Homoousion was holily and religiously asserted in opposition to Arian perversity." This Creed they, and those for whom they spoke, held and would maintain to the end, as they testified under their own hands, condemning Arius and his disciples, and all who thought with him, and Sabellianism, "Patripassianism" (an old Latin nickname for the crudest form of Sabellianism), and all other heresies contrary to this Nicene faith; and especially anathematizing the Ariminian formulary, framed at Nicè in Thrace, and subscribed, "by means of fraud and perjury," at Constantinople. They then added the Nicene Creed, with its anathemas; and with the variation, "And in one only-begotten *God*, Lord Jesus Christ:" and appended a request (rather too like one made by Ursacius and Valens to Julius) that if, after this voluntary declaration of their faith, any one should calumniate them or those whom they represented, such a person might come with letters from Liberius to any orthodox bishops whom he should approve, in order to a fair trial of the question. Liberius, on receiving this paper, felt warranted in admitting the three delegates to communion, and gave them a letter, addressed in his own name as "bishop of Italy," and on behalf of the Western bishops, to sixty-four Eastern bishops as represented by the delegates, of whom Cyril of Jerusalem was named second. He greeted them as "brethren beloved," spoke of their document as "resplendent with the light of the faith," accepted the doctrinal statement of the deputies as orthodox and Nicene, and declared that it had

"done away with every trace of suspicion." He annexed that statement to his letter, as the best means of preventing all misapprehensions; enforced the supreme authority of the Creed which had been framed at Nicæa under divine guidance by a number of prelates, equal to that of the servants "by whose aid Abraham, through faith, overcame so many thousands;" described that Creed as "containing the perfect truth, and as silencing and overthrowing the whole multitude of heretics," as a "strong and insuperable bulwark of the faith, being comprehended in 'the hypostasis' and 'the name of the Homoousion'" (a phrase which shows, as one might expect, that he understood "hypostasis" in the Latin sense of "substantia," as equivalent to "ousia"). He then enlarged on the criminal subtleties of Ariminum, and on the subsequent rejection of the Ariminian "blasphemy" by almost all who had been beguiled, or rather coerced, into accepting it, among whom he included the prelates addressed; and concluded by a significant observation—all the more significant because connected with the remark that the Easterns had now evidently come to a better mind—"Whosoever, after this Council (of Western bishops), shall decline to anathematize Arianism, must be held excommunicate from the Church, which does not recognise children of adultery."

Taking their leave of Liberius, the delegates sailed for Sicily, where a Council of bishops assembled to hear their profession of Nicene faith, and to give them a letter of fraternal recognition; and it is evident that other councils were held for the same purpose in other parts of the West. Fortified by a variety of synodal letters, the Eastern deputies returned home, and a Council was held at Tyana, in Southern Cappadocia, at the foot of Mount Taurus, in the spring of the following year, 367. Eusebius of Cappadocian Cæsarea was the most distinguished prelate in this assembly, which included many who had accepted the Homoousion with an evasive explanation, at Antioch, in 363. The documents produced by the delegates were read and approved; and a circular was written to all those who had accepted the Antiochene resolutions of 363, announcing the general agreement of a "far greater number of bishops than those who had met at Ariminum," and exhorting the bishops to concur in the steps recently taken, and to assemble at Tarsus before the end of the spring, in order to a final synodal settlement on the basis of the Nicene Creed.

And now indeed it might seem as if the wounds of Christendom were about to be healed by that general return

of the Semi-Arians to Nicene orthodoxy, which Athanasius and Hilary, years before, had loved to anticipate. But this was not to be. On the one hand, thirty-four Semi-Arian bishops assembled at Antioch in Caria, and declared that, with all their desire to promote unity, they could not accept the Homoousion, and must stand by the Creed of the Dedication Council, ascribed to "Lucian the martyr," and maintained by many of their predecessors in the midst of great tribulations. On the other hand, Eudoxius, naturally alarmed at the prospect of a reinforced and united Catholicism, induced the Eastern despot to prohibit the meeting at Tarsus under severe penalties. And thus, in the weighty words of Newman, after "enough had been done, in the external course of events, to unite the scattered portions of the Church, and that end was on the point of accomplishment, the usual law of Divine providence intervened, and left the sequel of the union as a task for Christians individually." It may here be observed that of the three delegates, Silvanus alone proved steadfast in his Nicene profession; Eustathius relapsed into his "Protean" instability, and Theophilus was his thorough-going supporter. The failure of the attempt to hold a Council of Reunion at Tarsus in 367 is an epoch in the doctrinal history of the Church in that age; and it was also connected with more definitive resolutions on the part of Valens against the orthodox, for it was in that year that he received baptism from Eudoxius, their most formidable foe. But it seems that his first war with the Goths, which broke out in 367, and was the immediate occasion of his application for baptism, suspended for nearly three years any purpose which he may have formed as to a more systematic attack on the adherents of the faith of Nicæa.

In turning our attention, as we may now do, to the Western part of the Church, we have first to record the death of Pope Liberius, who closed an eventful episcopate in circumstances which might make men forget the dark episode of his temporary failure. He had returned to full Nicene orthodoxy; he was again a representative of the traditional faith of the Roman Church; and having been "converted," he had been permitted to "strengthen his brethren" by furthering the reunion of a large body of Semi-Arians with the Church in the summer of 366. On the 24th of September he died; and a series of unhappy events is associated with the establishment of his successor. In order to appreciate it, we must look at the condition of the Christian Church

and clergy in the capital of the West, the ancient capital of the world.

Several high Roman families had by this time embraced Christianity. Eminent among these patrician Christians was Sextus Petronius Probus, prætorian prefect of Italy and Illyricum, the head of that great Anician house which was the first of the senatorial families to embrace the faith, and which afterwards, under the Gothic monarchy, had a representative in Boethius. Probus is depicted by Ammianus in not very pleasing colours, as "pining when apart from prefectures," disposed to be "haughty towards the timid, and timid towards the bold," and as having oppressed the provincials in order to gratify Valentinian's greed for money. We cannot, then, attach much value to Claudian's praise of him as largely beneficent, and unspoiled by prosperity; and his Christianity seems to have been, for practical purposes, superficial. But his wife Anicia Proba, who lived to receive from St. Augustine a letter of religious advice, was famed for her charities and good works; and their palace, renowned for its magnificent marbles, was the "rendezvous," as De Broglie expresses it, of Christian senators, and a scene of princely hospitalities and rational pleasures which attracted the younger Christians of Rome. In short, the Christian community of Rome at this time was in a condition high above social insignificance: it was but a few years before that the burial of Junius Bassus, who died prefect of Rome, and a "neophyte," in 359, had been the occasion of a great work of Christian art in the form of a marble sarcophagus, representing in its sculptures "a cycle of consecutive ideas, all centring in Christ," as enthroned above heaven and between two apostles, and combining Old Testament scenes from the Fall onwards, with incidents of Holy Week; and a similar tomb, equally Christian in its symbolism, was to be erected, several years later, in memory of Probus and Proba. And in many a household less dignified than the Anician, there was wealth enough to be lavished on Christian objects of all kinds, among which, naturally, offerings to the bishop and to the various churches would hold a prominent place. Liberius doubtless received many such tokens of religious attachment, especially from Christian ladies of high condition: when he sate on his throne in the apse of the broad five-aisled St. Peter's, and looked across the Apostle's tomb towards his people in the stately pillared nave, he must have presented an appearance of unusual majesty; and his carriage, as it traversed the city on the

east bank of the Tiber, would be recognised by many respectful salutations from heads that carried themselves proudly enough in Rome. The advantages and comforts of his rank had been but too vividly present to his imagination during exile; and Felix, his rival, had struggled hard to retain his hold upon them. The heathen historian could not wonder that such a position should be an object of passionate contention; those who desired it, he says, had reason to strive energetically for it, although they would be the happier for ignoring Roman grandeur altogether.

And so it came to pass that, on Liberius's death, a fierce competition ensued with results both scandalous and tragical. The friends of Felix put forward Damasus, priest of the church of St. Laurence, a mile outside the Tiburtine gate—the least altered of all the "patriarchal basilicas," and full of interest for every visitor; while the deacon Ursicinus or Ursinus had the support of the late bishop's special circle. According to what Jerome says and Ambrose implies, Damasus had the majority of votes, and was duly elected; but Ursinus was shortly afterwards consecrated by the bishop of Tibur and a few other prelates, in a corner of the new basilica on the Esquiline, which bore the name of its founder Liberius, and also of an unknown Sicininus, and "under many popes," as Marion Crawford says, "was rebuilt and grew until for its size it was called, as it is to-day, 'The Greater St. Mary's.'" On his taking possession of this church, the Damasine party attacked his supporters; a conflict ensued, and persons of both sexes were "slaughtered," Jerome admits, "with the utmost cruelty;" on that one day, says Ammianus, 137 corpses were found on the floor of the church. He throws the blame of these horrors on both parties: the detailed story of the Ursinian faction, preserved in a memorial by two Luciferian sectarians, insists that the priority and legitimacy of election was with Ursinus, the candidate of those who had been faithful to Liberius in his exile; that Damasus, on the other hand, represented the Felix party, and after the consecration of Ursinus invaded the Julian church (S. Maria in Trastevere), at the head of a mob of charioteers and low fellows armed with clubs, committed a slaughter which lasted three days, then forcibly got possession of the Lateran, and there caused himself to be consecrated, and bribed the authorities to banish Ursinus; that he then tyrannized over the faithful, imprisoned seven priests, and after they had been rescued, pursued their deliverers, at 8 a.m. on October 26, to the Liberian church, where his supporters—here described as

charioteers, gladiators, grave-diggers—"together with the clergy," slew 160 persons (observe how numbers mount up) and wounded many more. Three days later, the Ursinians recited Ps. lxxix. in the church, demanded a council, and procured the recall of their bishop; but he was again exiled, and Damasus then committed a third massacre in the church of St. Agnes outside the Walls. It would be absurd to accept such a statement as trustworthy: and it is difficult to resist the evidence in favour of Damasus's right as regularly elected; even if we suspected Ambrose of prejudice, the impartial pagan historian would decide our opinion by saying that the expulsion of Ursinus was due to "the just suffrages of truth;" but it is at least as difficult to reject the conclusion that Damasus was, to some extent at least, cognisant of, and so far responsible for, the hideous results of those forcible means which were taken for the defeat of his adversary. He may have shut his eyes to them, or persuaded himself that for the maintenance of legal right it was sometimes necessary to employ very rough agencies; but they must have reminded him of what he has himself put on record, the fierce party contests of Roman Christians shortly before the edict of Milan, as to the treatment of the lapsed—contests which repeatedly disturbed the public peace, and passed through "sedition" into "slaughter." And we cannot think of his accession without a melancholy reflection on the extent to which the secular spirit, with its accompaniments of violent partisanship and the free use of "carnal weapons," had profaned the house of the Lord, the Church of Christ, in the ancient centre of Christendom. And when we connect this unhappy event with the sarcastic saying of the typical pagan aristocrat Prætextatus, prefect of the city, to Damasus, "Do you people make me bishop of Rome, and I will forthwith turn Christian," we cannot but acknowledge that the fine gold of the Roman episcopate had become dimmed by worldly prosperity, even as the Arianizing bishop of Constantinople, some years later, had become secularised by pompous surroundings; and that Ammianus was not unjust when he indirectly warned the prelates of great cities to avoid temptations which might place them in unfavourable contrast with their provincial brethren, whose "frugality of habits, humility, and simplicity of bearing recommended them as men of pure and modest character to the everlasting Deity and His true worshippers." Chrysostom, we may be very sure, would have disapproved the pomp which encompassed the ordinary life of a Roman bishop: his own tendency, indeed, was to an error in the

opposite direction: but Tillemont's comment is significant when (with an eye, no doubt, to some lordly French hierarchs) he applies Ammianus's words to show that "prelates who think to exalt their dignity and attract popular veneration by external magnificence *se trompent extrêmement.*" That stateliness, in Damasus's own case, gave an impression of haughty coldness, we infer from some expressions of St. Basil; but it is only equitable, and it is certainly pleasant, to bear in mind his worthier activities—to think of him as vigilant against the lures of Apollinarianism, corresponding with Jerome on Biblical questions, draining the waters of the Vatican hill into a channel still in use, erecting a baptistery on the north side of St. Peter's, and making the catacombs more accessible. We can best understand the pertinacity of the Ursinian opposition by considering the evil associations attaching to the party of the intrusive Felix, which Damasus would be regarded as representing. Ursinus was recalled by Valentinian on the 15th of September of the next year, 367, but was again banished on November 16, together with seven of his partisans, in consequence, says the "libellus," of bribery freely used by Damasus; and thus, by the agency of Prætextatus as prefect of the city—an office which he exercised, we are told, with a happy union of vigour and benevolence —"the disturbance excited by the strifes of the Christians," as Ammianus expresses it, "was allayed," and Rome enjoyed "a profound peace most agreeable to the feelings of her citizens."

Meanwhile, one fruit of this unhappy strife was an ordinance highly congenial to the feelings of the Roman clergy: Valentinian enacted that causes in which prelates, as such, were concerned should be tried not by the civil tribunals, but by the bishop of Rome and his colleagues. To this enactment the bishops assembled at Rome, some years later, appealed; and to it also Ambrose made explicit reference when in his 21st epistle he quoted, as "the words of the rescript," Valentinian's order that in matters purely ecclesiastical "the judge should be one who is neither inferior in office, nor different in right (*nec munere impar, nec jure dissimilis*), from the parties concerned:" the sense of which Ambrose condenses in the phrase which he ascribes to that Emperor, "It is not my business to judge between bishops." It will be observed that this does not bestow on the clergy any such immunity from civil tribunals in causes not spiritual as was partially conceded by Justinian, and more fully by Charles the Great, with results calamitous alike to society and to religion.

As soon as the abatement of these troubles allowed the new pope to attend to general Church affairs, he held, perhaps in 368 or 369, a Council, which excommunicated the veteran Arians Ursacius and Valens, and enforced the authority of the Nicene Creed. Athanasius received the synodal letter, and in reply expressed some surprise that the same measure had not been dealt out to Auxentius of Milan; a suggestion which was adopted by a subsequent Council at Rome (which addressed an extant letter to the Illyrian bishops), and by others in Spain and Gaul. Athanasius at the same time wrote his celebrated "Letter to the Africans," *i.e.* to the bishops of Western Africa, insisting on the contrast between the numerous Arian formulas and the single and all-sufficing creed of the Church, exposing the futility of Arian attempts to claim authority for the later, as distinct from the earlier, proceedings of Ariminum, and (as in his work on "The Councils") assuring those who disliked the term Homoousion that if they believed in the Son as eternal and uncreate, they believed all that Homoousion implied.

The Roman clergy were obliged to submit to what must have been a severe humiliation when Valentinian put forth a law, addressed to Damasus, and read in the Roman churches on July 29, 370, to the effect that ecclesiastics, and those who styled themselves "Continents," or celibates, were to abstain from visiting widows and heiresses under ward, and were also declared incapable of inheriting, or of otherwise acquiring, anything from women to whom they might have attached themselves on a religious pretext: any such bequest or donation was to be forfeited to the imperial treasury. The "religious pretext" seems to indicate the position of a spiritual adviser or director; and Gibbon praises the "honesty" of Jerome's admission, made twenty-four years later—"I am not complaining of this law, but I am sorry that we should have deserved it. The prohibition was made with foresight, and in the interests of strictness; yet, after all, it has failed to curb the avarice of the clergy." We may return to this point further on, in connexion with Jerome's experience during his own acquaintance with Roman society.

The seventieth year of the century was, however, destined to be marked by far different warnings for Christendom than a gentle restriction on clerical avarice could express. While Valentinian was thus correcting the worldliness of Roman ecclesiastics, and Damasus was fortifying his position against Ursinian intrigues, a

great epoch was at hand for the distracted Eastern Churches: a great persecution in the interests of heresy was to be inaugurated by a worthy successor of Constantius; and a great episcopate, remarkable for its concentrated and accumulated sorrows, and for the nobleness and fervour of spirit which confronted and endured them, was to immortalise a name only second to that of Athanasius.

CHAPTER XIX.

THE EPISCOPATE OF ST. BASIL.

The Eastern Emperor Valens returned home, after concluding a peace with the Goths, towards the end of 369. His designs for harassing his Catholic subjects were now revived, and by no means checked by the death of his spiritual counsellor Eudoxius. That unprincipled diplomatist, the representative of the political Arians—whose influence, two years before, had frustrated the effect of the recall of Eunomius, during the Gothic war, by prevailing on Valens not to give him an audience—closed his career in May, 370, when he had gone to Nicæa for an episcopal consecration. Thereupon the small number of Catholics at Constantinople ventured to make a certain Evagrius their bishop; but Valens, indignant at their boldness, drove the new prelate away, and gave his sanction to the election of Demophilus, a nobly born Thessalonian, and a moderate Arian, with considerable persuasive ability, who, as bishop of Berœa in Thrace, is said by Hilary to have recommended an Arian creed to Liberius. This translation took place shortly after midsummer; and according to the unfriendly (because ultra-Arian) Philostorgius, the usual acclamation "He is worthy," at the enthronement of Demophilus, was interrupted by some outcries of "He is unworthy." His accession was the signal for an outbreak of Arian cruelties; against which, we are told, eighty ecclesiastics of high character, of whom Urbanus is named the first, were sent to remonstrate with Valens, or petition for his interference. They saw him at Nicomedia: he dissembled his wrath, and, it is said, ordered the prefect Modestus to seize and destroy them. This was done, probably on the 5th of September, by placing them on board ship as if they were to go into exile, and ordering the sailors, when they were well out to sea, to set the vessel on fire and abandon it. It has been proposed to explain the deaths of these men by the hypothesis of accidental fire, or to suppose that the death of one or

more was exaggerated into that of eighty by the tradition which Socrates had received. The strongest objections to the story are the mention of "one presbyter" by Gregory Nazianzen when he is professedly giving an account of "the tragedy" (although elsewhere he uses the plural), the silence of Basil about so great a crime on the part of Arians, and, perhaps not less, his friendly correspondence with Modestus in after-days. Whatever was the fact, it was the commencement of a reign of terror, on which Gregory expatiates with indignant energy. But before it assumed its full proportions, an event took place which, if its significance was at all adequately perceived, must have tended to brace and cheer the spirit of the menaced Catholics of Asia Minor.

Basil, well named the Great, was at this time a priest at Cæsarea in Cappadocia, the city of his family and his birth, which in the third century was credited with a population of four hundred thousand. He had been born of noble and highly esteemed parents about 329, and in early youth had frequented the celebrated schools of Cæsarea, where he excelled his fellows and equalled his teachers; and after some stay at Constantinople, where he attended the lectures and secured the regard of Libanius, had gone to study at Athens, where he found intellectual activity in combination with rough modes of "taking the conceit out of freshmen"—from which, however, he was exempted, partly through the influence of Gregory, with whom he formed a close and religious friendship. They lodged and read together, and ere long incurred some jealousy through the exclusiveness of their companionship. This was when Basil was about twenty-one. He became proficient in all secular studies, including that of medicine, which, we are informed, was forced on him by his weak health. But the academic life was to him "an empty happiness;" it did not satisfy his spiritual aspirations; disregarding all remonstrance, he tore himself away from the society of fellow-students and lecturers; returned for a while to Cæsarea, was there detained, says Gregory, "in the public interest," and so came under the influence of his pious sister Macrina, who saw that his weak point was the literary vanity of a clever young man, and induced him to study ascetic types of devotion by visiting the monasteries of Syria and Egypt. In 358 he took the first step towards a ministerial career by becoming a Reader, and then went into religious retirement on the banks of the river Iris in Eastern Pontus, which, in order to allure Gregory, he describes in terms that indicate an almost modern appreciation

of highland scenery. "A lofty mountain, thickly wooded, watered by broad streams; below it a level space fenced by trees, enclosed on two sides by glens—like an isle of Calypso!" Gregory, to tease him, caricatures the scene as "your mouse-hole, with sunlight peering as through a chimney; your breakneck precipices, and the ceaseless roar of your cataract!" and after paying him a visit, makes fun of the rude cell, the coarse fare, the toilsome vine-planting. A recluse so distinguished as Basil could not but do much to promote monastic life in that country; while at the same time he was active in conducting what we should call missions, and awakening religious fervour. Emerging from this tranquil retreat in the year of the Council of Seleucia, he accompanied his namesake, the eminent Semi-Arian bishop of Ancyra, to Constantinople, and was a witness of the disastrous triumph of the Acacian Arianism. In 362 he returned to Cæsarea and was ordained priest, but very soon incurred the selfish jealousy of his bishop Eusebius, a pious but very inferior man, who had been abruptly transferred from a lay condition to the episcopate before he had acquired the clerical spirit. In order to prevent an outbreak of party feeling, Basil returned for a time with Gregory into Pontus, where he had a curious correspondence with Julian, but was recalled by Eusebius —in consequence, it appears, of earnest remonstrances from Gregory—amid the difficulties attendant on an expected visit of Valens in 365. He "made out the programme of resistance, and at the same time showed all possible respect to his bishop," whose entire confidence he thus secured, becoming "a staff to his old age," and practically vicar-general of the diocese, although, as Gregory says, he was still in the secondary place of a presbyter. He had been consulted by Eustathius and other bishops when on their way to the Lampsacene Council; and he now stood out as the most conspicuous ecclesiastic under the degree of bishop throughout Asia Minor. In his own city, beside his spiritual work, such as framing of prayers and monastic rules, and the good ordering of the clergy, he knew how to win hearts by providing for bodily needs, entertaining foreigners, taking care of virgins, and especially by using his influence to procure relief for the poor in a famine the most grievous within memory; and it is expressly recorded that his charity on this occasion extended to "the children of the Jews."

Naturally, he was admired and almost idolized; persons used to imitate his outward man, his slow walk, his deliberate speech, his absorbed look—with results more or less ridiculous, and perhaps

not without a needless increase of his "donnish" stateliness of bearing and his inaptitude for general conversation, which Gregory admits, while he says that amid intimate friends he could be playful and tell a good story. But a change was at hand. It was apparently in June, 370, that the archbishop or "exarch" of Cæsarea "gently breathed his last," as Gregory says, "in the arms of Basil;" and the election to this illustrious see became instantly a subject of absorbing interest throughout the Pontic "diocese," which included Cappadocia and Eastern Pontus among its provinces, and had Cæsarea for its head-city. The religious feeling of Cæsarea was naturally favourable to the appointment of Basil as the successor of Eusebius; but strong objections were raised—partly, or professedly, on the score of his weak health, but more really, although of course less openly, from a dislike and dread of his lofty and single-minded character—among the upper classes, the holders of high civil office, on the one hand, and the coarse, irreligious, and dissolute, on the other. This opposition possessed the sympathy of several of the suffragans of the archbishopric. These prelates had their own reasons for deprecating the elevation of one so majestic in his spirituality, and certain, as events proved, to be so severely observant of episcopal irregularities; they therefore set themselves to work—as Gregory says, by intrigues and conspiracies—against his election. But they did not succeed. Eusebius of Samosata, and the elder Gregory, bishop of Nazianzus, exerted themselves in his favour. The latter "wrote, advised, gave his testimony" successfully for Basil, and in that sense, as his son expresses it, "voted;" and although so weak and ill that he looked like a corpse on its bier when he was laid on his travelling litter, insisted on making the short journey from his own "rustic" church to Cæsarea, and there had the happiness of laying his hands on his son's dearest friend, and placing him, duly consecrated, in the episcopal seat, after which he returned home with health improved by the effort. When thus enthroned, the new primate was far from disappointing the high expectations that had been formed about him. His affectionate solicitude for all orders of his flock, especially for all sufferers, as the lepers and the poor; his foundation of a hospital "like a town in itself" outside the city, well furnished with all medical appliances; his erection of a new cathedral with adjacent buildings; his conscientious strictness in the ordination of clergy; his zeal in the exercise of discipline; his activity in preaching;

his readiness as an adviser and a comforter;—all this gave token of a spirit which proved its right to rule; and it is significant that once when he was rudely menaced by a high civil functionary, the "armourers and weavers" were foremost in the popular demonstration thus provoked. At the same time his dignified gentleness, devoid of all ignoble flattery, and exhibiting itself in action rather than in language, overcame the unfriendliness of the malcontent suffragans, until they learned to think that their well-being lay in close union with their chief.

Taking, then, the episcopate of Basil for our central point, it may be convenient to review the three main districts, so to speak, of labour or of solicitude, into which his manifold cares and burdens might divide themselves. These are—the persecution by Valens—the distractions and troubles of the whole Church—and the local or personal difficulties which beset the great bishop nearer home.

I. First, then, for the new Arian persecution, the fourth as we may reckon it with reference to those of 340, 355, and 360. It differed in one important feature from those for which Constantius was responsible, in that the Emperor did not, in this case, profess to be a theologian, and simply lent himself to the purposes of that party to which, when represented by Eudoxius, he had once for all entrusted the keeping of his conscience and the shaping of his religious policy. Valens was notoriously illiterate, and his addiction to Arianism was a mere dogged unintelligent acceptance of the creed of the bishop of Constantinople. But princes who were consciously in the dark as to the merits of a theological question have—as in the case of Louis XIV—been capable of determinately oppressing the maintainers of a particular side, under the dictation of those who represented the other. This was the case with the brother of the tolerant Valentinian. We have seen how he had acted in Bithynia, when exasperated by the Catholics of Constantinople; he found no difficulty in enforcing conformity to Arianism in Galatia; and we find him at Ancyra, the Galatian capital, in July, 371, when he was travelling leisurely through Asia Minor. He was preceded in this journey by Domitius Modestus, prætorian prefect of the East, a partisan of the Arians, and a gross flatterer of Valens for his own purposes; and Modestus's approach was in turn heralded by Arian bishops, of whom the aged Euippius, with whom Basil had been on friendly terms, was the chief. Their object was either to lure Basil into some concession, or to find

matter for an accusation to be laid before Valens. Basil steadily refused to admit Euippius to his communion. This, of course, increased the exasperation of the Arians; and at last, in November, Modestus arrived at Cæsarea, and summoned the archbishop to his presence. He came, says Gregory, as readily as if he were coming to a festival. Then ensued one of the most memorable conversations in Church history, which has doubtless been amplified by Gregory's rhetorical vein, but the substance of which seems trustworthy. After trying the effect of persuasion, or, as Theodoret says, of "gentle words," and advising the bishop not to stand out against the Emperor's religion "for the sake of a little dogmatic nicety," he took a more imperative tone. "What do you mean, Basil" (for he would not call him bishop) "by setting yourself up alone against the will of the Emperor?" "Explain," said Basil. "Why, you do not accept the Emperor's creed, to which all others have given in their submission." "That is because I, who am one of God's creatures, cannot worship a being supposed to be a creature;" he alluded manifestly to the idolatry involved, on the Arians' own showing, in their worship of the so-called highest of creatures, as elsewhere he says that with Arians "polytheism is dominant," that "they have a great God and a little one." Modestus made a foolish rejoinder about his own dignity. Would it not be an honour to Basil to take his side, and be associated with him? "You are, no doubt, a prefect," said Basil, "and one of those who rank as 'Illustrious'" (the highest class of officials of the empire); "but as for the honour I should get by being associated with you, it is not greater than that of being associated with any of my own people." Modestus, losing his temper, began to threaten: "Don't you fear what my authority can inflict, the penalties which I can impose?" "What are they? Let me hear." "Why, confiscation, exile, torture, death." "Try something else; nought of this kind frightens *me!* I have no property—I can find a home anywhere; my body is so weak that the first blow would kill me; and death would send me all the sooner to my God." Modestus was astounded: "No one ever spoke so boldly to Modestus before!" "Perhaps," said Basil, "you never before fell in with a bishop! We bishops are ordinarily gentle and humble, not only before the Emperor, but before the meanest of the people. But when God's honour is at stake, we look to Him only, and count all else as nought. Do what you will with me—you have the

power; but let the Emperor know that no menaces whatever shall make me assent to heresy." Modestus had enough good sense to "admire the manliness" of Basil; he gave up, for the present, the attempt to overawe him, and reported to his master that he had been baffled by a prelate who was superior alike to menace and persuasion. But, as Gregory of Nyssa tells us, another agent, Demosthenes, who held the eminent office of chief cook in the imperial household, and whom Basil once calls a "huge fat fish," tried his hand at the same task. After his failure, Modestus seems to have reappeared on the scene, surrounded by all the imposing terrors of a high imperial magistrate, within his railed-off and curtained place of judgment, with his criers, apparitors, lictors —all powerless before the bishop's high-souled constancy. Valens himself, on hearing of that constancy, could not but respect it. He arrived at Cæsarea about the end of 371, or the very beginning of 372, and on the feast of the Epiphany he repaired to the cathedral. He found it filled with an enthusiastic multitude, "a sea of people," as Gregory tells us; the majesty of the service, the solemn and graceful order which prevailed throughout the building, the "thundering" chant of the psalms, impressed him in spite of himself. But he was more than impressed, he was fairly overawed, by the sight of "the ruler of the people" standing calm and motionless in the sanctuary, evidently behind the altar, and, as in the "basilican" arrangement, with his face turned towards the congregation, but as it were absorbed in the consciousness of a Divine Presence. Around him stood his attendant ministers, with faces expressing the like religious awe. It was too much for the Arian despot; this manifestation of a Divine kingdom, independent and regardless of him and his, bowed him down. "His eyes," says Gregory, "were dimmed, his nerves shaken;" and when, after the dismissal of the catechumens, he came forward to present his gifts, and no one seemed ready to receive offerings from a heretic, he was only kept from fainting by being supported in the arms of one of the clergy. Nothing more passed on that day; but Valens soon afterwards paid another visit to the church, where Basil even admitted him into the sanctuary. A conversation took place, in the course of which, according to Theodoret, Basil put Demosthenes to silence, and the result of which was to enhance the Emperor's admiration for the bishop, whose hospital for the sick poor he enriched with the best imperial estates in the neighbourhood.

But these good feelings were transient. The Arians ere long

induced Valens to pass sentence of exile against Basil. He was to depart under cloud of night; the carriage stood ready, the archbishop's friends were clinging to him for a farewell, when suddenly he was summoned to the palace. Valens Galata, or Galates, the only son of Valens, a boy of six, had been taken seriously ill; the Empress Dominica was agonized by fear for her child's life, and, as she said, by terrific dreams which made her feel sure that this illness was a punishment for the measures taken against Basil. Valens sent for Basil, and urged him to pray for the child's recovery. He did so; the illness seemed to abate: but some Arians were called in to pray over the boy, and the Catholics (with a too common readiness to interpret events as judgments) persuaded themselves that this was the cause of the fatal relapse that followed. Once more, it is said, Valens resolved to banish the archbishop; the mandate was ready for signature, but he took the repeated splitting of his pen for a deterrent sign, and definitively abandoned all hostile intentions towards Basil; and Modestus himself, according to Gregory, being soon afterwards taken ill, eagerly besought Basil's attendance and prayers, and on recovering ascribed his restored health to the archbishop, told the incident to many, and continued to be his admiring friend.

Thus calm days ensued, in regard to the Arian persecution, for Cappadocia and for Pontus. But the hearts of Basil and of his people must have been wrung by the tragical tidings that would reach them, in the summer of 372, from the south. An Arian was placed in the see of Tarsus; the orthodox presbyters stood aloof, and Basil exhorts them to require from ex-Macedonians only the Nicene Creed and an acknowledgment that the Holy Spirit was not a creature. At Antioch matters were very serious. Valens had arrived there in the spring or even earlier; Meletius had already, about the end of 370, been driven into his third exile; the banner of the faith was upheld once more by Flavian and Diodore, who now, in their office as priests, were as zealous and energetic as when, in the condition of laymen, they baffled the artifices of the crypto-Arian Leontius. "They stood up like rocks," says Theodoret, "to break the beating waves." Paulinus was doubtless as steadfast and faithful. The Catholics, we are told, were driven from their churches, and had to meet, first at the foot of a mountain, then on the bank of the river; then, when expelled from this spot (perhaps it was on that occasion that some were drowned in the Orontes), they resorted to the soldiers' exercise-ground, on the

north of the city. Their preacher was Diodore, who, according to Basil, was such a charming speaker that many who heard him became better; but Theodoret says that he was supplied with controversial topics by Flavian. A famous monk named Aphraates, and another, Julian, whose Syriac name was Sabas, came to Antioch to assist the faithful. Diodore, as specially obnoxious from his activity, was banished into Armenia. The church of Edessa, so long renowned for its fervour and zeal, was deprived of its bishop Barses, who was sent to one place of exile after another; and Valens commanded Modestus to disperse the Catholics when, disowning an Arian intruder into the bishopric, they met for prayer outside the city. Then it was that Modestus, passing through the market-place at daybreak in order to execute this command, saw a woman walking very fast, with an infant in her arms. "Whither away?" he asked. She replied, quite simply, "To share the fate prepared for my fellow-believers." "But that child?" said Modestus. "That it may share in such an enviable death," was the mother's instant answer. Modestus reported this to the Emperor, and dissuaded him from carrying out his intentions towards the people. "Well," said Valens, "but at any rate give the priests and deacons their choice—communion with the new bishop, or exile." Modestus assembled them, and addressed them in "gentle words." Eulogius, the leading presbyter, replied to the prefect by asking whether the Emperor were also a bishop. This sarcasm, of course, provoked Modestus; he commanded Eulogius to communicate with those with whom the Emperor was in communion. "We obey our legitimate pastor," said Eulogius. Upon this, eighty of these ecclesiastics were sent to Thrace; but as the towns and villages through which they passed received them with applause, they were separated, and Eulogius, with another named Protogenes, was carried to Antinous in the Thebaid. There the bishop was Catholic; they went to church, but found a very small congregation. "Why is this?" "Because most of the people are still pagans." The two exiles immediately recognised the work set before them. Eulogius devoted himself to intercession in a cell. Protogenes, who was highly educated, turned schoolmaster; he found a commodious place, gathered some boys around him, taught them to write, and combined with this instruction the reading of Scripture, dictating parts of the Psalter, and making them learn by heart passages from the Epistles. His prayers are said to have in some cases been followed by recovery from illness;

but, with an unfortunate disregard of the necessary disposition, he made the acceptance of baptism a condition of being prayed for; and whenever he could persuade a person in health to ask for "the seal of the Lord"—that is, as Theodoret uses it, not confirmation as such, but baptism—he knocked at Eulogius's door and desired him to officiate. Eulogius, it is said, would sometimes complain of the interruption. "The salvation of the erring," was the answer, "is yet more important than your prayers!" The two good priests continued at Antinous throughout the persecution, and the tears of the townsfolk at their departure attested the value of their holy work.

While they were but entering on that work, the church of Egypt was, as it were, watching with inexpressible grief the gradual withdrawal of its own peculiar treasure. Athanasius was approaching his end. He must have been annoyed by the terms of an edict of Valens, stigmatizing certain Egyptian monks as having abandoned their municipal obligations through idleness—a law which Gothofred assigns to January 1, 373. It was on Wednesday, May 2, in the same year, that the end came. He died quietly in his own house, "after so many conflicts," says Rufinus, "after so many rewards of endurance"—the greatest, the most glorious, of all the men who in the post-apostolic Church have "contended for the faith once delivered;" the man who towers above all contemporaries, however able, however earnest, as supreme in unity of aim, in variety of gifts, in force and tenderness, "in quickness," as Basil says, "to see, in energy to execute, in large-heartedness to sympathize;" he, the unbroken, the "unwearied," the living symbol of the "immortality" of the faith; he, so kindly and equitable towards weaker brethren, so generously hopeful as to apparently erring friends, so ready to discern "the difference between things and names," so "royal-hearted" amid storms of suffering, so absolutely loyal, not simply to a Council or a doctrine, but to an ever-living, ever-present Head and Lord. The Catholic heart, throughout all churches, must have been pierced, at the tidings of his death, with the sense of having lost, in Gregory's words, the "guide and teacher of its confession," in Basil's, "the pinnacle of the whole structure." "The master had been taken away from their head." At Alexandria, he was succeeded by his old companion Peter, whom he himself, no doubt at the request of his people, had consecrated five days before his own death as his successor. But Palladius the prefect, who, as Peter says, was an avowed and very zealous pagan, headed

a band of soldiers, and, attended by a brutal heathen crowd, attacked the same church of St. Theonas which Syrianus had invaded in 356, insulted the Christians, profaned the church, the very altar, with hideous orgies, and perpetrated violences which in some cases produced death. Peter escaped from this scene of horrors, and after a short interval, betook himself to Rome, as his predecessor had done at the intrusion of Gregory the usurper; meanwhile another Gregory, or another George, was inflicted on the Alexandrian church in the person of that Lucius who had vainly attempted, ten years before, to make an impression on Jovian. A few days after the sacrilege at the church, he was installed by aid of Euzoius, who would thoroughly enjoy the triumph of thus dominating in his native city; we are assured that the pagans expressed their satisfaction in a shout of "welcome to the bishop who denied the Son, and whom Serapis must have brought to Alexandria:" and, on the other hand, there was some resistance on the part of the clergy and other Catholics, of whom some were arrested, imprisoned, and tortured with lighted torches or iron nails, under the authority of Magnus, count of the imperial treasury, who endeavoured, but in vain, to extort a promise of outward conformity from nineteen clergy; they bravely answered, "It is nothing new for us to serve God; as for our belief, we never will believe that the Son was created; we know that the Homoousion is grounded on Scripture itself." They were banished to Heliopolis in Phœnicia, a town which had been the scene of a furious pagan outbreak under Julian, and where "no one could bear to hear the Name of Christ." Eleven bishops were exiled to a town called Diocæsarea, inhabited by Jews, and situated in Palestine; many persons who expressed their grief at these cruelties were scourged, tortured, and sent to work in the mines—a fate like that which befell Catholic clergy of Egypt in 356; a Roman deacon who had brought the letters of communion from Damasus to Peter was beaten on the neck with stones and lead, and put on board ship for the mines of Phennesus: he silently made the sign of the cross on his forehead. There is no need to pursue the tale of these enormities. About two years later, or more, at the end of 375, the usurper attacked the monasteries of the desert, and some of the monks were sent to an island in the marshes, where the Christian faith had never been heard of: we are told that they converted the inhabitants. A monk named Moses, demanded by the queen of the Saracens as a bishop for her people, was ordered to repair to Alexandria for consecration;

but on arriving, positively refused to receive the episcopate from the hands of Lucius, and was, in fact, at his own desire, conveyed to the abode of other bishops, doubtless exiled for Catholicism.

Another incident of this persecution was the exile of Eusebius of Samosata. It took place in 374: the bishop, advising the imperial officer for his own sake to conceal the nature of his errand, quietly performed the evening service as usual, and then, attended by one servant carrying a cushion and a book, crossed the Euphrates by night, was followed by his people next morning to a place called Zeugma, exhorted them to be tranquil and orderly, and set out for his place of exile in what Gregory calls a noble spirit. He was accompanied into exile by his nephew Antiochus, whom Basil congratulates on such a privilege. We are told that his successor, a certain Eunomius, a gentle and amiable man, was horrified at finding that the people would not speak to him, would not even bathe in the same water that he had used. He abandoned his intolerable post: a sterner Arian succeeded him, and although equally detested, made the clergy who disowned him feel his power. By such means as these, wholesale expulsion, banishment, and other severities, the intrusive prelates succeeded in holding their ground.

Gregory of Nyssa, Basil's brother, was one of those theologians who fail as bishops. He showed a want of common sense which provoked Basil to say that a Christian really ought not to be "so silly;" and after three years of episcopal life he was still "totally inexperienced in church affairs." He was harassed in 375 by Demosthenes, once the Emperor's cook, now "Vicar," or vice-prefect, of the Pontic "diocese:" this old foe of the Catholics now endeavoured to seize him on some vexatious charge, brought forward by an insignificant person named Philochares at an Arian meeting at Ancyra. Gregory succeeded in concealing himself: Demosthenes caused another meeting of Arians to be held at Nyssa, and installed in the see, by their agency, one whom Basil scornfully described as "a slave worth a few obols." "The creature," "the messenger of Satan," as he calls Demosthenes, who seemed to know and care nothing about doctrine, but certainly "was a friend of heretics," troubled the Church of Basil's exarchate to the full stretch of his power: he subjected the Cæsarean clergy to the oppressive burdens of civil office; did the like to those at Sebaste who communicated with Basil, and caused a Catholic named Asclepius, for refusing

Arian communion, to be beaten till he died, "or rather, until by scourging he was transferred to life. This crime," Basil adds, "is in keeping with all the rest, persecutions of presbyters and teachers, and everything else that is like to be done by men who use the imperial authority at their pleasure."

Such were some of the main features of this fourth Arian persecution. It lasted eight years, reckoning from that year 370 in which, after two previous threatenings in 365 and 367, it broke forth in earnest. Gregory compares it to a wild hailstorm and a barbaric raid, and enumerates irruptions into churches, insults to "beloved altars," bodily inflictions on aged bishops, plots secret and open, banishments, confiscations. Basil, writing in 376, calls it the "heaviest of persecutions," *because* the persecutors bear the Christian name; and depicts the desolation of churches, the cessation of services, the privation of festal joy, the gatherings of Catholics, including the old, the infirm, the children, for prayer in the open country amid rain or snow. But two years later, pressed by a second war with the Goths under Fritigern, Valens stopped the Arian terrorism in 378—giving, perhaps, a verbal promise to recall the exiled confessors, or in some cases actually summoning them from exile. On the 9th of August in that year he perished in the battle of Hadrianople, or, by one account, immediately after it, while sheltering himself with some attendants in a cottage to which the enemy set fire. It was believed that a monk named Isaac had warned him that, if he went to war without "restoring the pastors to their flocks," he would never return. But no such alleged prediction, with its fulfilment, is needed to deepen the solemn gloom of that dire disaster—a disaster which was, as Rufinus says, "the beginning of evil to the Roman empire, then and thenceforward."

II. And now as to that multiform anarchy and confusion, caused by the prevalence of heresy in the East, which so constantly occupied the thoughts and saddened the heart of Basil, who in one passage illustrates it by a sea-fight during a storm. Arianism was riding on the high places of the earth, as insolently as in the worst days of Constantius: not one or two churches were shattered by the storm, for in fact, says Basil, varying his imagery, "the pest of heresy was spreading from the borders of Illyricum to the Thebaid. The doctrines of true religion were overthrown, the rules of the church were in confusion;" heretics, sometimes the meanest of men, were getting hold of bishoprics; the flock was bereft of true

pastors; discipline was extinct; a fierce party-strife was raging everywhere; unbelievers were laughing at Christian discord; unsettled minds were losing their faith; the orthodox were avoiding the churches profaned by heresy, and "lifting up their hands to God in the wilderness." "The wisdom of this world had superseded the doctrine of the Cross:" there was every variety of heretical thought, from Sabellianism, recently revived in full force, to Eunomianism which tried to perplex simple Churchfolk by playing on the double import of the phrase "knowing God." Apollinaris was assailing the belief in Christ's assumption of our whole manhood, and advancing to strange varieties of doctrinal innovation: Macedonianism was degrading the Holy Spirit to the level of created beings, and borrowing "fallacies" and verbal refinements from Anomœanism; but its adherents were comparatively few. Basil exerted himself in personal controversy with heretics; but he craved earnestly for sympathy and aid from the more fortunate, more united Westerns. With piteous emphasis he begged them to remember the duty of supporting the weak; he asked for a deputation of Western prelates to visit the East, and support those who, like himself, were struggling to uphold the Nicene Confession. This was the great subject of his anxiety; but beside this there was the disappointment caused by the failure of attempts to reunite the Semi-Arians to the Church—the failure which dated from the abortive scheme for a synod at Tarsus; and there was the distressing schism between the two orthodox communities at Antioch, the adherents of Meletius and of Paulinus. In this latter case, the difficulty was how to get the claims of Meletius recognised without alienating the "Eustathians." Basil knew that the Westerns stood by Paulinus, while he and his Eastern brethren were in close relations with Meletius. He endeavoured to secure Athanasius as a mediator between Meletius and the West; he entreated him to "suggest some method of help, to act as a Samuel for the churches:" he was aware that Athanasius was not in communion with Meletius, but he persuaded himself that by argument and negotiation, by the exercise of some mutual forbearance, the venerable father of the orthodox and the sweet-tempered representative of converts to orthodoxy might still be brought together, and some arrangement might be made, satisfactory to all parties, on the basis of a general recognition of Meletius as the true bishop of Antioch. In this hope he was, as at several other times, over sanguine. When, for instance, he proposed that

Athanasius should write first to Meletius, he was expecting more than at that point in the affairs could be granted. Athanasius could not abandon Paulinus; and there were misgivings which he, and such as he, might not unreasonably feel as to the Semi-Arian tendencies which had been observable, some time back, in many who supported the rival prelate. The real gain to Basil from these efforts was the formation of a sort of intimacy, by means of correspondence, with the man to whom, above all others, he looked up: an intimacy full of beauty and pathos, a bond between the elder and younger generation of Catholic doctors and confessors—one remarkable expression of which is Basil's proclamation, in his own church, of Athanasius's excommunication of a wicked Libyan governor; another is Basil's habit of showing to his friends a letter from Athanasius, to the effect that the Nicene Creed should be the *one* test for converts from Arianism; and yet another is Athanasius's exhortation to some who suspected Basil of Macedonianism, "Let them put away all suspicion, and thank God for so glorious a bishop!" On this subject four of Basil's letters are well worth reading—the 66th, 67th, 69th, and 82nd—all to Athanasius, together with the brief 80th, in which he says that "if he *could* have personal intercourse with so great and apostolic a soul, it would well make up for all the afflictions of his life."

In regard to the wider prospect of possible help from the West in the contest with Asiatic heresy, Basil was doomed to a yet more trying disappointment. He sent messenger after messenger; after corresponding with Athanasius, by means of Dorotheus, a deacon of the Church of Antioch, he wrote to an eminent Western prelate (most certainly Damasus) to express his regret that as yet no succouring hand had been held out to the suffering Eastern Church, as in those days when Dionysius of Rome exhibited his practical sympathy for the afflicted Christians of Cappadocia. Now, he wrote, the evil was more pressing: it was not the demolition of buildings, but the ruin of Churches; not the captivity of the body, but the worse thraldom of the soul! Dorotheus was sent with this letter, in the first instance, to Alexandria, whence Basil hoped that some of Athanasius's clergy would be sent on with him to Rome. But some delay ensued. At last Dorotheus was enabled to go to Rome, and was there furnished with letters from Damasus and other Western bishops: these were written after a large Council had met at Rome, probably, as Tillemont and Father Puller think, in the end of 371, or at least, as Maran says, not later than the

opening of 372, in reference, for the most part, to Church affairs in Illyria. The synodal letter announces the deposition of Auxentius of Milan, denies the right of the Ariminian Council to be regarded as an expression of the mind of the Church, and sums up the Catholic faith as the confession of "the one Godhead, power, and being of the Father and the Son, and of the unity of the *hypostasis*"—meaning essence—"in the Holy Spirit with the Father and the Son." Dorotheus was accompanied on his return by a Milanese deacon named Sabinus, by whom Basil sent, in reply, letters to the Westerns, including one which was drawn up in the name of the Eastern bishops, and probably by Basil's own hand. One letter, to Valerian of Aquileia, expresses the warmest gratitude for that prelate's kindness in writing to him, and quotes the text about "cold water to a thirsty soul." "Most honoured brother, there is a terrible famine of charity among us, and this makes your letter the more valuable." He must have been gladdened by this amount of personal kindness, and yet more by the synodal declaration of orthodox faith, "marked with the impress of Apostolic truth." But he wished for a more definite Western intervention: and nothing came. At last, in the summer of 375, a large Council of Illyrian bishops received a report from a bishop named Eustathius as to the prevalence of the Macedonian heresy in the Churches of the province of Asia and of Phrygia, and also as to irregularities subsisting among them in regard to the appointment of bishops, priests, and deacons; thereupon the Council framed a synodal letter to the Easterns, enforcing "the co-essentiality of the Trinity of Persons coinhering in each other," giving some counsel on the subject of ordination, and also announcing the deposition of six (apparently Illyrian) bishops for not confessing the Son and the Spirit to be, in Nicene phrase, "from the essence of the Father,"—in a word, for Arianism. This letter, entrusted to a bishop named Elpidius, was accompanied by one from Valentinian himself, who was in Illyria at the time. The imperial document is remarkable; it was doubtless written by a bishop, and adopted by the Emperor. He refers to the unconscientious acquiescence of many persons in the creed patronised by their sovereign—clearly with a view to the Arianism of his brother. He exhorts the Asiatic bishops not to persecute the orthodox: he tells them that he has often sent like exhortations; he would now, once again, be clear of all responsibility for their misconduct. He affirms the Homoousion on Nicene authority, and expressly bars out the gloss which would take it as

synonymous with Homoion, so as to make the Son merely an eminent creature: he holds, with councils recently assembled in Rome and Gaul, that there is one and the same essence of Father, Son, and Spirit, in three Persons, that is (a remarkable phrase for a Western) "three perfect hypostases." In a terse antithetical phrase he asserts the Divine personality of the Redeemer, very much as Cyril of Alexandria long afterwards asserted it against Nestorius: He was "God clothed with flesh, not a man clothed with God (*Theophoros*)." It will be observed that the synodal letter has nothing equivalent to this passage. The imperial letter concludes with a condemnation of the doctrine (ascribed to Marcellus) as to the originally "potential" character of the Sonship, and with an assertion of the Eternal Filiation.

Had Valentinian lived some few months longer than the autumn of 375, he might have followed up this letter by a pressure on Valens which would have delivered the Eastern Catholics from their misery. But he died, in a manner very little in accordance with the devotional earnestness implied in this letter, from the bursting of a blood-vessel in a fit of violent wrath against some envoys sent by the Quadi to deprecate his revenge, at a town on the Danube, on November 17, 375. Thus Valens was left free from the ascendency of the brother to whom he owed his crown; and the Eastern Church would know that it had lost a protector. Basil had written to the Italian and Gallic bishops, by Sabinus, who had brought him the letter from Valerian of Aquileia; he had learned in 373 that Eusebius proposed another mission to the West, but had answered that "after looking all around he knew not whom to send," and he hinted that Meletius himself, then in exile, might prove somewhat "punctilious" if dealt with by a letter, which could not put before him all the difficulties of the case. In 375 he had been advised to send his brother Gregory; but had answered that perhaps Gregory might decline the mission, and that certainly he was not sufficiently a man of business to discharge it alone. And, he added with some bitterness and some resentment at what he thought the unsympathizing formality or haughtiness of Damasus, "what could a man incapable of flattery say to one who sits on his own lofty eminence, too high up to hear those who speak the truth to him from the ground?" The fact was, he had been sorely vexed by hearing first, that Damasus was displeased with a memorial of his, probably relating to Meletius, and had sent him a draft memorial which he was

expected to adopt "word for word" as a prelude to any action on the part of the West; and afterwards, that the adherents of Paulinus were boasting of a letter in which Damasus had (quite consistently) addressed that prelate as the bishop of Antioch. "I am not surprised," he wrote; "the Westerns know nothing at all about Eastern affairs." And when, in the spring of 376, Dorotheus, with Sanctissimus, probably a priest of the church of Antioch, that is, of Meletius's communion, being ardently desirous of promoting reunion between East and West, obtained from the Easterns a commission to go to Rome, Basil, although he did not oppose it, was not hopeful. "If God's wrath still presses on us, what help can we get from the superciliousness of the Westerns? They neither know the truth nor endure to learn it; they act on their own preconceptions. I had thought of writing individually to their 'coryphæus,' but as to Church matters I should only have just hinted to him that they do not understand our case, and will not take the way to understand it; and generally I should have admonished him that it was not right to insult those who are brought low by trial, nor to mistake arrogance for dignity!" Here we may observe that he was not in a position to know the better points in Damasus's character: at the same time, if he wrote in "a temper," much must be allowed for his repeated disappointments. However, he sent two letters—the first, in the name of the Easterns to the Westerns; the second, individually, to the bishops of Italy and Gaul. In the first, the Westerns are reminded that hopes have often been entertained in regard to their assistance, and have often been proved illusory. "Neither found I," he quotes, "any to comfort me." "Why do not Westerns write?" and, still more, "why do not some of them come?" He reckons this year 376 as the thirteenth of Arian domination; meaning that Valens, almost from the outset of his reign, which began in 364, took his side against Catholicism. He entreats the Westerns not only to write letters, but to send deputies; the friendly voice of a foreigner would be a great comfort. The second letter, expatiating on the misery of the persecution, intimates that it may in time reach to the West; and prays that the Western Emperor (Gratian) may be informed of the afflictions of the Easterns, or, at any rate, that some may come into the East from the West who may see with their own eyes a complex tragedy which no words can adequately describe. Something was gained by this mission of the two priests, but that something was no more than kindness expressed

in letters; and in the next year, 377, they were again sent to the West with a letter begging for a visit, if possible, from Western brethren (it would be like "visiting the sick"), and intimating a grave suspicion of the orthodoxy of Paulinus. In this latter object they signally failed. Dorotheus, on arriving at Rome, heard Peter of Alexandria, in the presence of Damasus, reckon Meletius and Eusebius among "heretics," and broke out into expressions of indignation, of which Peter complained to Basil, who in reply ascribed the irritation of Dorotheus to "the difficulty of the times," and added mournfully, "I seem for my sins to be unsuccessful in everything!"

There was, however, one great Western Church to which Basil might well look with hope and satisfaction, ever since the close of 374. The see of Milan had, on the 7th of December of that year, been redeemed from its recent disgrace by the consecration of Ambrose, who at the time of his most unexpected election was unbaptized, and was acting, by the appointment of Probus, the prætorian prefect, as governor of Liguria. The well-known story, first published nearly forty years afterwards by his secretary Paulinus, is to this effect. While he was exhorting the people to observe due order in the election of a bishop, a child's voice was heard to say, "Ambrose Bishop," and the whole people, as if under some overpowering mysterious impulse, took up the cry; whereupon Ambrose, in consternation, tried to escape by ascending his tribunal and "torturing" some prisoners, by returning home and pretending to profess philosophy, by taking the strangest means for blackening his own character, and by quitting Milan at night; this last attempt was baffled, for he was found in the morning at the Roman gate of the city. Reference was then made to Valentinian, pending which Ambrose concealed himself on the estate of one Leontius. The Emperor signified his assent; Leontius then gave up Ambrose, who, finding further resistance hopeless, declared that, at any rate, none but a Catholic prelate should baptize him. After his baptism on November 30, he strove to get the consecration deferred, but in vain; he was made to pass rapidly through all the grades of the ministry, and was then on the eighth day, December 7, made bishop—the case being so special, and marked, as men thought, by so striking an indication of Divine direction, as to dispense with the rule about the necessity of a probation-time between secular office and the episcopal consecration, but still not so as to abate his own sense of the abruptness of the

transfer, which had constrained him "to teach while he had yet to learn." All this would not, in detail, be narrated in letters from Italy to Asia Minor; but Ambrose sent some of his clergy to request of Basil that the remains of his exiled predecessor Dionysius might be restored to the Church of Milan. And from these messengers the Cæsarean primate heard how his new Italian brother—eleven years younger than himself—had been brought by strange paths, under a marvellous process of training and guiding, to the second bishopric of the West. "I glorified our God," Basil wrote in answer, "who in every generation chooses out those that please Him; who of old raised up a ruler for His people from the sheepfolds, and who now has drawn a man from the imperial city, entrusted with the government of a nation, a man of lofty spirit and noble birth, of conspicuous position, of well-known eloquence, to take charge of the flock of Christ. Come then, O man of God, since thou didst not receive Christ's Gospel from men, but the Lord Himself removed thee from the civil judgment-seat to the chair of the Apostles; fight the good fight; heal any that are diseased with Arianism; renew the ancient footprints of the fathers!" He goes on to eulogize the modest and courteous manners of the messengers from Milan, and to narrate briefly the discovery and authentication of the remains of Dionysius the Confessor, which were found in the place where they had been laid, in a chest which contained no other bones.

In another matter, which deeply interested Basil, the Roman Church, after some indications of what he would call a want of keen insight, declared emphatically on the orthodox side. Vitalis, a priest of Antioch, had visited Rome in 375, and had given to Damasus a statement of faith which the Pope was disposed at first to think satisfactory. But on second thoughts he referred the matter to Paulinus, whom he had recognised as the true bishop of Antioch, after being asked by Jerome (in letters which suggested that the best right lay with Paulinus) to direct him as to the rival claims. By so acting, Damasus ignored Meletius. Vitalis, failing to secure the support of Rome, caused himself to be consecrated bishop for the Apollinarians at Antioch, in 376. Soon after Epiphanius, visiting Antioch, heard Paulinus accused of Sabellianism, and ascertained the falsity of the charge by examining the statement of faith presented by Paulinus to Athanasius in 363. He also elicited from Vitalis an avowal of heresy

on the crucial point of the Apollinarian question, that the Incarnate Word had not a "rational human soul." Basil, who, as a partisan of Meletius, was prejudiced against Paulinus, did not feel satisfied with what he heard of the latter's orthodoxy; he suspected him, without evidence, of Sabellianizing, and complained that Paulinus had been too easy in admitting some of the adherents of Marcellus of Ancyra to his communion, as were also certain bishops exiled from Egypt, who were won over by the Marcellians on the ground that Athanasius and his colleagues had in 371 accepted a statement of belief presented on behalf of his former friend. With all his reverence for Athanasius, Basil did not refrain from blaming Paulinus on this score, in a letter to the Westerns (assigned to the year 377), in which he expressly denounces Apollinaris as a heretic, and assumes that Paulinus is inclined to that Marcellian error which "nullifies all our hope." And one result of that letter was, in the opinion of Tillemont and the Benedictine editors of St. Basil, the formal condemnation of Apollinaris, his disciple Timotheus, and Vitalis, by a Roman synod in the presence of Peter of Alexandria. This Council, however, is dated by Hefele and (with some hesitation) Puller in 376. It was referred to afterwards by Damasus, when writing to some particular church which asked him, it seems, to condemn Timotheus.

One other event in the history of theology has a close connexion with the subsequent fortunes of Western Europe. We have seen that Ulfilas, bishop of the Goths, was not perverted from Catholicism to Homœan Arianism in 360, but had all along been an Arian—at first a follower of Eusebius of Nicomedia, and afterwards a Homœan or Acacian. That there were among the Goths some orthodox Christians, who held the "exact faith," is indisputable, for it is affirmed by Basil in a letter of the year 374; but when the Huns pressed Fritigern and his Goths southward to the banks of the Danube, it was natural that their petition to be received within the empire should be accompanied by an offer to adopt the Emperor's Arian faith, and by no means improbable that some direct or indirect influence on the part of Ulfilas should have materially contributed to such a resolution. The immigration, permitted by Valens—who could hardly have effectively prevented it—took place in 376; and that year may be called an epoch in Church history, inasmuch as the example set by the immigrant Goths was followed by the rest of their race; and thus a large and energetic force of Teutonism, destined to play a great part in the "barbaric"

occupation of the West, became self-committed to a spurious and degraded Christianity, and the Church found herself disabled from entirely friendly relations with, for instance, so great, and on the whole so just, a prince as Theodoric, and even with "the first of the knights," the high-souled and generous Totila. Burgundians, Suevi, Vandals, and afterwards the all but savage Lombard invaders of Italy, followed suit, and made "barbarian" almost a synonym for "heretic;" the persecuting instinct of the Arian Constantius revived in the Vandal Gaiseric, still more in Hunneric; and Catholic Christianity had to wait more than a century for the conversion, if such it could be called, of Clovis, and some two centuries for the more genuine conversion of Reccared and his Visigoths in Spain.

III. Of the personal sorrows of Basil, and the troubles which beset him in the primacy of Pontus, little can here be said. They were a series of vexations apparently inexhaustible—clouds returning regularly after rain. Troubles caused by the persistent unfriendliness of those comprovincial bishops who had opposed his election; troubles arising from the still more unexpected coldness of his naturally good-hearted uncle Gregory, who was not mollified until a pathetically humble entreaty on Basil's part had led to a personal interview; troubles consisting in the misconduct of the "chorepiscopi" of the diocese of Cæsarea, who were accused of staining their hands by simony, and of ignoring his ultimate authority in regard to postulants for minor orders; troubles from the alienation of the bishops on the coast of Pontus, whom, with a noble humility and frankness, he urges to meet him and state their grievances; troubles, again, from the irregular and lawless misconduct of some of his own clergy. The people of Neocæsarea, who were more than inclined to Sabellianism, and narrowly conservative in temper, could not understand why the archbishop should encourage monasticism, nocturnal services, antiphonal or other kinds of psalmody, which they had not inherited from their own first father in the faith, Gregory "Thaumaturgus." Encouraged by their bishop Atarbius, they greedily caught up false charges against Basil, as if his teaching were "injurious to souls;" at "public entertainments" abuse of him became a favourite topic, and he was obliged to demand, in the name of mere justice, a fair opportunity for clearing his character in the eyes of a Church whose leading men had once tried hard to secure him as an educator. His learning, it seems, was made a ground of offence; his theology was "the wisdom of this world;" and he caustically asks whether

on such themes every one who thought himself an authority was accepted, although on agriculture or on music experts alone were allowed to speak. Some years before, in 372, a monk, sitting at a dinner-party in company with Gregory Nazianzen, complained of a sermon which he had heard Basil preach on a saint's day. "He spoke well enough as to the Father and the Son, but was wrongfully reticent on the divinity of the Holy Spirit: this might be policy, but it was not piety." Whereupon Gregory explained Basil's motives for a certain reserve or "economy" as to the application of the Divine title to the Third Person, when His Divinity might be inferred from other phrases; but the rest of the company scouted such a proceeding as cowardly, and the dissatisfaction grew and spread until it reached the ears of Athanasius, who wrote rather sharply in rebuke of these suspicions, and exhorted the malcontents to obey a bishop "such as any country might long to have," and who had only "made himself weak in order to gain the weak." The fact was, that Basil—rightly or wrongly—had considered how he could disarm that Arianizing hostility which might silence the truth by expelling him, and had thought of securing this point by speaking of the Holy Spirit not explicitly as "God," but as "uncreated," so as to suggest the idea of His true Divinity without prematurely imposing it on prejudiced minds. That he had no tenderness for Macedonianism itself appears repeatedly in his writings: he says, for instance, that "those who reduce the Spirit into the class of ministering beings are far from the truth, and that those who call Him a creature ought not to be admitted to communion." Another calumny was based on the use of the phrase "Three Hypostases." The old inference that it implied Tritheism —an inference disposed of at Alexandria in 362—was revived to his discredit; and he had to give the usual explanation that he took "hypostasis" to mean, not essence, but real subsistence in the sense of personality, and that *prosopa*, if used instead of *hypostases*, would suggest Sabellianism. A more painful trouble was brought upon him by Eustathius of Sebaste. This man's theological instability was singularly combined with an excess of asceticism, which incurred the censures of the Council of Gangra at some date not precisely ascertained. Eustathius had begun life as a pupil of Arius, but had become conspicuous as a Semi-Arian: as we have seen, he had been one of the delegates of that party who signed the Nicene Creed at Rome in 366; but this "conversion" was mistrusted, though Basil for some time hoped that its sincerity would be practically proved.

Eustathius, however, "shifted like a cloud." Basil himself was involved in suspicion, insomuch that a zealous bishop, Theodotus of Nicopolis, declined to join with him in Church service. He prevailed on Eustathius to sign an elaborately orthodox profession of faith, but speedily learned that this impracticable person was charging him with various misdeeds, including that of procuring his signature by unfair pressure, and was also inferring that because Basil, twenty-five years before, had written a letter to Apollinaris (a letter, too, which had been tampered with), he must needs be in effect an Apollinarian. This hostility, which Basil endured for some three years in silence, had two motives: Eustathius was irritated at having been importuned to reaffirm his "Nicene" conformity, and was desirous of standing well with the dominant Arian party at Antioch. Accordingly, he showed his hand in 375 by signing at Cyzicus a formula expressive of Macedonianism, and by denouncing Basil as a "Homoousiast;" yet he failed, says Basil, to gain the countenance of the Arians, who probably knew what his adhesion was worth. Two years later Basil spoke of him as a leader of the Macedonian heresy, and urged the Westerns that, as he had been rehabilitated by them under Liberius, they should now expose his tergiversations.

Again, during Basil's episcopate—towards the close of 374—the partition of Cappadocia into two provinces brought difficulties and annoyances which Basil had never looked for, and in the treatment of which he did not act very wisely. Tyana, the scene of the Council held in order to Reunion, was made the capital of the new province of Second Cappadocia; and three months later its bishop, Anthimus, assuming that ecclesiastical divisions must of course adapt themselves to civil, claimed the rights of a metropolian, treated the primate with strange rudeness, and even intercepted some baggage-mules laden with provisions ("sucking-pigs and fowls," says Gregory) from the estates of the Cæsarean see. It then occurred to Basil that he might, at any rate, secure his own jurisdiction over Sasima, a little town belonging to the new province, and near the spot where this robbery was committed. It had no bishop, but it should have one, and his friend Gregory should be the man: with him there, Basil would have an effective hold on that bit of the frontier. Gregory shrank from the proposal: the place was odious in his eyes, a "disagreeable little village, all dust and noise, in the highway traversed by tax-collectors and prisoners, with a floating population of diverse

habits." Basil urged him to accept the bishopric as an act of loyalty to the Church, and of friendship for himself, and pressed the point so strongly as to overbear opposition. He spoke of high aims, of piety, of duty, of sacrifice, of personal regard; he brushed aside Gregory's objections as due to a spiritless indolence; and the consecration took place at Nazianzus: but Gregory never resided at Sasima, and renounced all obligations to it in order to act as his father's coadjutor. Anthimus tried to enlist him against Basil, and Gregory gives a lively description of an interview in which Anthimus "asked about the marshes of Sasima, entreated and threatened, extolled Tyana as if greater than Cæsarea, and at last went off unsuccessful, sniffing and calling Gregory a 'Basilizer.'" He afterwards sent him a summons to a synod, which was of course ignored. This business was one of the few grave mistakes of Basil's life. Absorbed in his own schemes, he set his strong will against the weaker will of his friend, who, even while yielding, felt that he had been treated with great want of consideration, and in his soreness attributed the proceeding to a "love of ruling" on Basil's part. Basil on his side was evidently disappointed by an unresponsiveness which he set down, not perhaps quite erroneously, to a selfish love of ease. Their old intimacy was thus broken; and Basil must afterwards have regretted that he had lost the sweet and cheering friendship which might have helped him through many a painful hour. And he had not too many friends: a reserve and stateliness of manner kept most people at a distance, and Gregory had once told him that he did not sufficiently provide against misconstruction; he says himself that he was apt to forget small matters; his many disappointments, the suspicion and the opposition which hung heavy over his path, made him morbidly sensitive, and dulled his power of understanding the feelings of others. But it is pleasant to know that he and Anthimus were soon again on friendly terms; and he derived much comfort from the hearty and confiding regard of Eusebius of Samosata, with whom, he says, he was ready to face great trials, and without whom he "could hardly look at slight troubles." Of his veneration and affection for Meletius there is no need to say anything; the honour, the dignity, the tranquillity of him who was, in his eyes, the one legitimate bishop of Antioch, were matters of lifelong interest for Basil: and he also rejoiced in the friendship of the learned and warm-hearted Amphilochius, who induced him to write in 376 his work "On the Holy Spirit," and to whom he

addressed in 374–5 three letters on points of canonical discipline. This good prelate held a Council in his city of Iconium, in which the Macedonian heresy was condemned, the belief in "three Hypostases" was pointedly distinguished from Tritheism, and the faithful were exhorted to unite the Holy Spirit "with" the Father and the Son in their doxologies. Basil's treatise was devoted in part to the defence of this form of doxology, and in part to the refutation of Macedonianism by an exposition of the baptismal formula and of other texts bearing on the Divine co-equality of the Holy Spirit. The conclusion is pathetic: "The Lord will give you—by us or by others—satisfaction as to any points still unsettled, according to the knowledge supplied by the Holy Spirit to those who are worthy of Him."

As we observe the multifariousness of Basil's correspondence, we are especially struck with the abundant verification, in his experience, of that deep saying of St. Paul as to the relation between affliction and the power of administering comfort. He had once feared that his troubles would affect his reason, but had added, "The more we need God, the more let us trust in Him!" One who could thus trust, could help others; and so, out of the deep well of his own sorrows—especially, perhaps, of the distress produced by an indomitable enmity which struck at him with the most varied slanders—and also out of his frequent suffering from illness (chiefly in the form of liver-complaint), which was probably induced by an ill-regulated "asceticism" regardless of the ordinary laws of health, and which seriously impeded his power of sitting over books—there springs up in his letters that marvellous readiness of sympathy which can identify itself with every form of trouble, the miseries of a whole province, or the religious anxieties of a pious widow, or the troubles of another widow, a relative of his own, under severe exactions, or the difficulties of a conscientious soldier, or the excessive taxation of church property, or the case of some distinguished persons suddenly afflicted, of an old man suddenly impoverished, of a bereaved wife or husband, of a father whose son has been taken away in his prime of youth, of a priest whose stock of corn has been carried off, of monks whose buildings have been burnt by Arians, of peasants compelled to swear that they would pay their taxes: be the form of evil or suffering what it may, the sorely tried, much-enduring archbishop can throw his great heart into it with genuine tenderness and appropriate consolations. He reminds a kinsman of the various classes of persons

prayed for in church—"brethren travelling, those who serve in the army, those who speak boldly for the name of the Lord, and those who exhibit the fruits of the Spirit;" and adds, "I think you must be included in all of these classes." We seem to be admitted into the depths of his inner life, when he reiterates the exhortation to take all trouble patiently from the hand of God, to submit to a benignant Fatherly discipline, to play the athlete at God's bidding with a braced-up spirit, to look through all clouds or storms to the inexpressible radiance of the future glory. His frequent topic is that the contest must come before the crown, but that the crown is assured by the Lord's promise.

Such was the life-work of him whom we may, perhaps, call the most heavily afflicted of all the great Fathers: he seemed often enough to fail, to meet with impassable walls of difficulty, to spend his strength for nought; but when he died, worn out before his time, at the age of fifty, on the New Year's Day of 379, a few months after peace had been granted to the Eastern Churches, and, as Gregory of Nyssa says, early in the ninth year of his episcopate, those who heard him murmur with his last breath a commendation of his spirit into the Redeemer's hands, might be well assured that his work was well done, and that his labour had by no means been in vain in the Lord. Truly might his dearest friend say of him, that "all his life long he had kept in view the end of life, the going forth from the body to be present with the Lord." In days so wild and dark as those which were assigned for his ministry, the Church was clearly all the richer and stronger for such an exhibition of steadfastness in the faith, and of the power of Christianity to discipline and to ennoble a strong character, as was contained in the short and troublous episcopate of St. Basil.

CHAPTER XX.

GRATIAN AND THEODOSIUS.

THE dire catastrophe of the battle of Hadrianople, marked as it was in secular history by a carnage only equal to that of Cannæ, was an event which, in its results as regarded the Eastern Church, might be recollected by members of that Church with the feelings which a great deliverance must inspire. It closed the period during which the Arian heresy was able to use the imperial power as its instrument. It placed the dominion of the East, and practically of the whole empire, in the hands of a well-disposed and accomplished youth, the docile pupil of the great Churchmen of his time—too ready, indeed, to use his power not only for the protection of the Church, but for the coercion and oppression of dissident Christians; a prince personally gracious and amiable—deficient, as events proved, in force of character, dependent on his nearest advisers, passionately addicted to amusements, particularly that of hunting, as to which Sozomen tells a story of a pagan official whom Ambrose saved from death by interrupting Gratian's sport and pleading for his pardon. In short, Gratian was one of those in whom boyhood is unduly prolonged, but still one who must have inspired a peculiar interest, and who must always be thought of with tenderness, and, in regard to his early and tragical death, with compassion. "Faithful in the Lord, kindly and gentle, pure in heart," such are the simple emphatic words in which Ambrose embalms the treasured memory of his beloved young Emperor.

This prince, the eldest son of Valentinian I., was born in the year of the Council of Ariminum. On August 24, 367, before he was nine years old, he was solemnly presented by his father at Amiens to the assembled troops, with the diadem and imperial ornaments, as "Augustus" and associate in the sovereignty. Since

that splendid inauguration, he had been called by his father's death in 375 to take possession of the government, and had shown prudence as well as moderation in accepting the irregular military investiture of his little half-brother Valentinian (then four years old) with the ensigns and titles of supreme power. He secured for himself a practical supremacy throughout the West; while the son of the Empress Justina resided at Milan under his mother's tutelage, Gratian, the son of Severa, kept his court at Treves, "the illustrious abode of monarchs," as Ammianus calls it, and the birthplace of the great bishop of Milan, who became his chief ecclesiastical adviser.

Ursinus, not content with harassing the Roman Church, was also intriguing at Milan; "now," as Ambrose tells us, "before the doors of the synagogue, now in secret—for he durst not do so in public—joining himself to the Arians." It was apparently for this that Gratian banished him to Agrippina (Cologne); and when he did at length grant him a hearing, it was to exhort him to abandon his position as a party chief—an exhortation which, naturally, proved unsuccessful. The Ursinians next suborned a Jew named Isaac, who had for a time professed Christianity, and had then "profaned the holy mysteries" by a relapse, to denounce Damasus, and invoke the imperial authority against him; but Gratian, after ascertaining that Isaac's accusations could not be substantiated, pronounced Damasus innocent, and banished the accuser into Spain. The Church of Rome was vexed by other attacks on ecclesiastical order and unity, besides those which proceeded from the faction of the disappointed aspirant: for the Luciferians upheld their own bishop, named Aurelius, at Rome; and Florentius, bishop of Puteoli, deposed by a Roman Council in 372 for co-operating with the Luciferian sect, succeeded in regaining his see. Moreover, the Donatist conventicle, commonly called Hillfolk (a name that recalls the Scottish Covenanters) because their meeting place was in a cave or hollow of a hill beyond the walls, were not overawed by Gratian's edict of 377 for the expulsion of the African "rebaptizers" from the churches which they had resumed. These indomitable sectarians sent to Rome a bishop named Claudian, who boldly denounced the Catholic succession as so many "pagans" devoid of power to administer the sacraments; and in defiance of all sentences and prohibitions, this sixth overseer of the Roman Donatists retained his stronghold on the "Hill," and was suffered to buy over some of the poorer Church-people and to receive them

by iteration of baptism into his sect, or rather, in the view of a Roman Council of 378 or 380, which gives us this information, to deprive them of what they had already. This Council, at Damasus's request, freely examined the charges made against him, pronounced him innocent, and then addressed a memorial to Gratian. The young Emperor had already shown his attachment to the Church by providing, in a law of May 17, 376 (*Qui mos*), that matters affecting religion in which clerics were litigants—as distinct from purely criminal cases (a distinction afterwards unfortunately ignored)—should be tried first by their own bishop or by a provincial synod, and then, on appeal, by a synod of the "diocese" itself: and he had also departed from his father's tolerant policy by ordering the confiscation of sectarian places of worship.

In order to understand the language of the Council's memorial, it is necessary to observe that under the prætorian prefects of the empire were deputy rulers of "dioceses," mostly bearing the title of "vicarii:" thus we have the "vicarius" of "Italy," of Africa, of Spain, of Gaul proper, of Britain, of Macedonia, Thrace, Pontus, "Asiana," respectively subordinate to the prefects of "Italy," Gaul, Illyricum, and "the East." But some confusion was caused by the use of "Italia" and "Oriens" in two senses, for the prefecture and the "diocese governed by a Count," and also by the use of "prefect" for the governor of Rome itself with its neighbouring territory, while the "Vicar of the City" had several "suburbicarian" provinces under his rule, being one of four "vicarii" of the prætorian prefect of Italy.

The Council then asked: "Let those whom we have condemned, but who, like the bishops of Parma and Puteoli, ignore our judgment, be sent to Rome by the prætorian prefect of Italy and the 'vicarius' of Rome; or, if their sees are in *remoter parts*" (which would include at least the larger part of the West) "let them be sent to their own metropolitan for trial. If the contumacious prelate is himself a metropolitan, let him be sent to Rome, or be tried by judges—say fifteen—to be named by the Roman bishop; and if Damasus is again accused, let him be exempted from ordinary civil jurisdiction, and allowed to plead before the Emperor himself." Father Puller, in the third and revised edition of his "Primitive Saints and the See of Rome," observes that Gratian not only conceded the request, but even enlarged its scope in his rescript beginning *Ordinariorum*, by providing for what had been overlooked, *i.e.* that "suburbicarian"

bishops who had fled into "remoter parts" should be sent to Rome by the local authorities; for he, Gratian, in his reply associates with the Italic prefect and the Roman vicarius the prefect of "the Gauls," whose rule extended over Gaul proper, "Germany," Spain, and Britain. This was in effect to create for the Roman see, by sheer imperial authority, a patriarchate as wide as the West. He followed up these acts of favour by renewing the decree of confiscation, and by banishing the chief Roman Donatists to a distance of a hundred miles from the city.

And he was hardly less decided in his line of action against paganism. If he did not until the close of his reign efface from his coins the title of Supreme Pontiff, he declared his hostility to the ancient worship by refusing to wear the ornaments of that dignity, by seizing on the revenues, and abolishing the immunities, of the pagan priests and the vestals, and by removing the altar consecrated to Victory, which, with its image of the goddess holding in her hand a laurel wreath, stood in the senate-house, and was honoured with an offering as the prelude to senatorial deliberations. Of this we shall hear more later on.

Before we follow Gratian into his settlement of Eastern affairs we may observe that the Western Church at this period, although it had its own troubles, had on the whole been exempt from the tumult of confusion and strife which raged so disastrously among Eastern Churches. It had two pre-eminently great bishops, Ambrose and Martin: but before we speak of the noble missionary bishop of Gaul, we may remember Valerian, metropolitan of Aquileia, and Philastrius, who, having "guarded the Lord's flock in Milan during the episcopate of Auxentius," had made many converts to the faith at Rome, and, on becoming bishop of Brescia, had found there an ignorant, but honest-minded and receptive population; Eusebius of Bologna (his eminent namesake of Vercellæ had died in 370), who, when he visited Milan, assisted Ambrose in his episcopal work; in Spain the aged Pacian of Barcelona, "on the heights," as Jerome says, "of the Pyrenees, a man of chastened eloquence, eminent for his writings and for his conduct," who had written against the Novatians, on Penance, and on Baptism, and in whom, while he lived, the Church of Spain possessed a link with the disciplinarian prelates of the Council of Elvira. Looking into Gaul, we find Phœbadius of Agen, the author, as Jerome records, of a work against the Arians, in which he pleaded strongly for the Homoousion, and one of those who held out longest at the

Council of Ariminum, although, as Tillemont expresses it, he and his venerated companion Servatius of Tongres—who had once visited Athanasius at Alexandria—"had not quite enough intelligence to cope with their artful Arian foes." Phœbadius had, perhaps, presided at a Council of Gallic bishops which met at Valence in 374, at which Council was also present Justus bishop of Lyons, who, some years later, was to signalise himself by resigning his see, and embracing a solitary life in Egypt, out of grief for a popular outbreak of fury which, in spite of his efforts, had ended in murder. But all Gallic sanctities of this period appear to be gathered up and represented in the truly glorious life of one man, whose name, perhaps, has been associated through more than fourteen centuries with a larger amount of popular enthusiasm and affectionate reverence than that of any other eminent Western saint, and attached to some church of old foundation in many an English city, the most venerable being that which looks down from its hill on Canterbury. This man was Martin of Tours, whom the historian and last rector of his Oxford parish justly describes as "a saint to be proud of."

When Gratian took possession of the East, Martin was rather more than sixty years old. He had been born as the son of a pagan tribune in the army at Sabaria, in Pannonia, now Lower Hungary, in 316 or 317: when he was ten years old, he caused himself—against his parents' wishes—to be made a catechumen; at twelve, he was only hindered by his youthfulness from retiring into a monastic solitude; but at fifteen his father constrained him to enter the army in obedience to an imperial decree which called the sons of veterans into the service. Thus, "seized by force, and bound," says his biographer, Sulpicius Severus, "he was involved in the obligations of the military oath, being contented with one servant as a companion," to whom he insisted on making return of all kindly attendance, often handing him his food, or drawing off and cleaning his shoes. A kinder, simpler, more genial bearing than his, towards all his comrades, could never have been seen. "His patience and humility were beyond all human standards." All his pay, save what was necessary for his daily wants, went in feeding the poor, clothing the naked, assisting the distressed. It was while he thus gave token of that Christian tenderness which throughout his life was one of his characteristic graces, that the memorable incident took place which Christian art has so perpetually connected with his memory. The young soldier-boy—he

was but just eighteen—was serving in Gaul, and on one bitter day, in the middle of an exceptionally severe winter, he met at the gates of Amiens a poor man miserably destitute of clothing, who begged charity of the passers-by, but in vain. Martin gazed at the helpless shivering figure, and having no money, drew the sword which he wore, and cut in half his white woollen military cloak; one half he threw around his own shoulders, the other he gave to the beggar. On the next night, while asleep, he dreamed that he saw Christ wrapt in that very half-cloak which he had thus, for Christ's sake, given away, and that he heard Him say to the attendant angels, "Martin, though as yet only a catechumen, hath clothed Me with this garment." He at once presented himself for baptism, A.D. 334, and for nearly two years afterwards remained in the Emperor's service, at the special request of his tribune; at the end of that time he came into collision with the prince who held supreme command in Gaul, and who perhaps, as Tillemont says, was Constantine II., by refusing a donative on the somewhat fanatical ground that military service in itself was incompatible with Christianity—a view sometimes taken by enthusiastic Christians, as by Maximilian, a young Numidian martyr, in 295, but never adopted by the mind of the ancient Church. Several years afterwards he paid a visit to Hilary, who had become bishop in 353; Hilary, having ascertained the peculiar nobleness and genuineness of his character, wished to ordain him deacon, but Martin exclaimed, "I am unworthy; I will only consent to become an exorcist;" and afterwards went to visit his parents in Illyria. On the way he fell among robbers, impressed them by his religious courage, and converted their chief. Arriving at home, he converted his mother, not his father, to Christianity, and (not unnaturally in the land of Ursacius and Valens) endured scourging and other ill-treatment from Arians, in the cause of Catholic belief, or, as Sozomen (after Origen) calls it, of "the dogma." Returning westward in 356, he made a cell for himself at Milan, but was driven away with much violence by Auxentius, and retired with one priest as his companion to Gallinaria, a little desolate islet off the Riviera coast, where they lived on roots of herbs. Learning in 360 that Hilary's exile had come to an end, he went to find him in Rome, and then followed him to Poitiers. There at Locociagum, six miles from Hilary's own city, he established his "monasterium" or cell, and was soon believed to exhibit wondrous powers of procuring, by intense prayer, the recovery of persons already dead. In 371 or 372, the see of Tours

being vacant, the ardent desire of the people to have Martin for their bishop was accomplished, but not without some opposition—as in St. Basil's case—on the part of some of the comprovincial bishops, particularly of one prelate named Defensor. However, the "united desire and opinion," or earnestly repeated wish, rising into the emphasis of a demand, which expressed the mind of the laity, overcame the idle cavils of prelates who sneered at Martin's mean garb, his rough hair, and his undignified aspect. The consecration, destined to have such momentous results in the extension of Christianity through central Gaul, took place on July 4; and Martin forthwith showed that he was unchanged by this accession of dignity. He insisted on having a place for monastic retirement. At first he used a little cell, built up against the wall of the church; but the crowd of visitors proved too great, and Martin founded, at about two miles from the city, and on the other side of the Loire, under the shelter, in part, of a high rock, and in a spot peculiarly difficult of access, the monastery which even in his own lifetime became famous, which through the Middle Ages was venerated as one of the great sanctuaries of Europe, the "Majus Monasterium," or Marmoutier. Humble and poor indeed was the first beginning of that illustrious house: a little wooden cell was built by Martin for himself, and near it some eighty disciples of his, living in strict community, taking food only in the afternoon, abstaining (save in illness) from wine, mostly wearing a camel-hair dress, practising no manual art save that of writing, and spending much time in the study of Scripture, dwelt in cells of which some were actually hollowed out of the rock. Among these monks were many of high birth; and it was edifying, we are told, to see how they forced themselves to practise this humility and patience: most of them afterwards rose to the episcopate, for many a church longed to secure as its bishop some one "from Martin's monastery." When Martin came to officiate in his cathedral, it was observed that he remained silent and absorbed in his little business-room until the hour of service arrived: in that room he used to sit on a little rustic seat such as slaves were wont to have, called in the Gallic tongue "tripetia," but by educated persons a "tripod." He was never seen to sit down in church. One of his first proceedings, after he became bishop, was a visit of necessary business to the Court of Valentinian I. at Treves: he found the palace-doors closed against him by the malign influence of the Arian Empress Justina, who was afterwards to cause such annoyance to Ambrose. Twice

the bishop attempted to gain an audience; after the second repulse he had recourse, we are told, to fasting and prayer, sackcloth and ashes; on the seventh day (not, according to Sulpicius, without extraordinary tokens of his sanctity) the admission which had been sought was granted, and Valentinian treated him with cordiality and respect. It was probably soon afterwards that he became so well known to, and so much dreaded by, the heathen priests of inland Gaul. Tours, as a central position, could give him great facilities for mission circuits; and Gregory of Tours describes his evangelical activities in a few words: "He wrought the conversion of many pagans, and broke in pieces their temples and statues." Sulpicius tells the famous story of "St. Martin's pine," how he had destroyed a very old temple, and had announced his intention of cutting down a sacred pine tree that grew close to it. The priest of the pagan rustics, at the head of a fierce rough band, asserted his right in the tree: it should *not* be cut down. "There is nothing sacred in the trunk of a tree," said Martin: "why do you not rather confess the true God whom I serve?" The story goes on to tell how he was challenged to stand beneath it and abide the certain consequence of its being cut down by the pagans' own hands. "Catch it as it falls, and if your God is with you, then you will be scatheless." Martin agreed. A vast crowd assembled: the pagans plied their hatchets; the huge tree quivered, tottered, and seemed about to fall upon Martin; he raised his hand, and signed the cross; the tree swerved round, and fell in the opposite direction: whereupon the great multitude of pagans, overawed by what they deemed a manifest sign from above, impetuously demanded to be made catechumens by the laying on of the hands of the bishop. And thus a district, which before his time was almost devoid of Christians, became ere long distinguished by the number of its churches and monastic settlements. Of course, at times his attempts were violently resisted. On one occasion, at Leprosum, he was repulsed with blows; on another, in the territory of the Ædui, a ferocious pagan pursued him with drawn sword. Sulpicius, under an evident preconception, covers his path with "miracles." He does not compare or classify the stories which he gives: he displays, says Dr. Cazenove, "no perception of the meaning of the word evidence;" and he actually argues that to disbelieve that Martin did such and such wonderful works is to disbelieve that Christ spoke the words recorded in John xiv. 12. Some of his tales imply no more than the impressiveness of a strong personality; as when

he says that if a rustic population withstood him in defence of their temples, he would so mightily sway their minds by "holy preaching, that they, as if beholding the light of truth, would themselves overthrow their own temples" in a fervour of newly kindled zeal. He had the influence of a true enthusiast, and was also sometimes observed to be in a state of visionary ecstasy. But there was about him evidently an irresistible moral fascination: his beautiful tenderness of heart, shown in the kiss which he gave to a loathsome leper at the gates of Paris, the immovable serenity of his face, the bright sweetness of expression indicating, as Sulpicius says, the heavenly gladness which filled his soul, the voice which was for ever speaking of Christ, the tears shed over personal enemies and detractors (for he had such), the patience which tolerated injurious attacks even from the inferior clerics, the manifest yearning over benighted souls, as when his impassioned sermon to a gazing crowd of pagans near Chartres was interrupted by his groans and mournful exclamation, "Why should so great a multitude be ignorant of the Lord and Saviour?"—all this combination of charity, enthusiasm, unsparing self-sacrificing energy, intense faith, entire devotion to the cause of that Saviour, was doubtless as impressive as any instances of remarkable answers to his prayers in rendering Martin the most successful missionary, and the most beloved and honoured bishop, that Western Europe had yet seen.

Gratian was resident at Treves during the first four months of the eventful year 378. He had been contemplating for some time past the impending necessity of taking part in his uncle's Gothic war; and it was while thus preparing for an eastward journey that he requested Ambrose to draw up for him a compendious treatise on the Christian faith. The request was readily granted. Ambrose wrote the first two books of his treatise "De Fide,"—about the close, apparently, of 377,—and set forth in them the unity of God as preserved in the Trinitarian confession; the essential oneness of Christ with the Father in regard of the Divine attributes; the multifarious incoherencies of Arianism; the true significance of Christ's title as "Image of God;" the comprehensiveness of the prologue of St. John's Gospel in its assertion of the truths denied by various heresies; the "change" in God involved in the Arian notion of a Sonship not strictly eternal; the unique mysteriousness of the true Sonship as necessarily and properly divine; the affinity of Arianism to pagan polytheism; the self-assertion of

Christ as inconsistent with a created personality; the decision of the controversy by the great Council of "the 318;" the orthodoxy of the first determination of the Ariminian Council; the Judas-like death of Arius; the futility of the Arian concession that the Son was "not a creature like *other* creatures;" the various names applied to Christ and significant of His uniqueness, and His likeness to, and eternal oneness with, the Father; the Arian misinterpretation of such a text as "None is good, save one, God;" the attribute of Omnipotence assigned to Christ in Scripture; the reference of certain texts to the human feelings and thoughts of Christ, not to His divinity; in connexion with this point, the true interpretation of the texts, "My Father is greater than I," "He became obedient unto death," "If it be possible," and, which is remarkable, of "neither the Son;" and, finally, the answers which Christ as Judge might be supposed to make to the various professions of heretical opinion. At the end of the second book, Ambrose promises Gratian a victory over the Goths, who, as he says, were foreshadowed in the mysterious language of Ezekiel (xxxviii. 2), and whose insurrection had brought distress on the very districts which Arian persecution had already visited. "It has been clearly shown," he wrote, "that those who have violated the faith cannot be safe: *now* an army will be led, not by military eagles, but, O Lord Jesus, by Thy Name and worship. This army is sent forth, not by some unbelieving country, but by that Italy which is wont to send forth confessors: in this case, an Emperor appears whose mind is not wavering, whose faith is fixed. May he who owns Thee to be the true Power and Wisdom of God, not temporary but eternal, be supported by Thy Majesty, and attain the rewards of his faith!"

Such was the expression of devout hope with which Gratian was followed in his eastward journey. He was, says Gibbon, "far advanced on his march towards the plains of Hadrianople," when he heard of the tragedy which they had witnessed on the 9th of August, 378. He did not verify the confident auguries of the bishop of Milan; he "was too late to assist, too weak to avenge," Valens. He retreated to Sirmium; and there it was that he put forth an edict of general toleration, from the benefits of which only three sects were excluded—the Eunomians, the Photinians, the Manicheans. All others might "freely and without restriction hold assemblies in their houses of prayer." This concession was too clearly wrung from Gratian by the peculiar difficulties of the

time; and, as we shall see, he returned, as soon as he thought it safe, to the repressive policy on which he had previously entered. Of course he recalled the Catholic exiles; and he sent a distinguished military commander, bearing the dreaded Persian name of Sapor, to drive out the Arian prelates, and, as Theodoret expresses it, to "restore the sheepfolds to the good pastors and religious flocks." For the most part, this mandate was executed without opposition; but in Antioch a remarkable scene took place.

The Arians of that city had Dorotheus for their bishop: he, of course, was expelled. But as to the question between Paulinus and Meletius, there was some attempt made to effect the association of Meletius with Paulinus, who was by this time an aged man, in the bishopric. Theodoret (who, however, must be regarded as a partisan of the Meletian side in this controversy) describes Meletius as addressing his rival with friendly kindness: "Since the Lord of the sheep has entrusted me with the care of this flock, and you have received the oversight of another, and both the flocks are agreed in faith, let us, my friend, combine the flocks, and put an end to the contest for priority. Let us feed them in common, and let us set the holy Gospel on the central seat—the episcopal throne—and let us take our places each on one side of it, and let the survivor govern the flock alone." We are told that Paulinus refused this proposal, alleging that he could not, consistently with Church rules, admit as a coadjutor a prelate of Arian consecration. Meletius was thereupon forcibly installed in one of the churches outside the city; and ultimately, according to Socrates and Sozomen (whose account is confirmed by the older authority of two Italian Councils, those of Aquileia and Milan, but is ignored by Theodoret, very likely under partisan feeling), six of the leading clergy, including Flavian, were induced to bind themselves by an oath to advance no pretensions to the bishopric on the death of either Paulinus or Meletius, but to permit the survivor to act as unquestioned bishop of Antioch. This concordat, which (early in 381) virtually made peace between the two parties, appears to have had the approval of the bishops of Northern Italy.

Before this, and about nine months after the death of St. Basil, *i.e.* about September, 379, a Council of 146 bishops met at Antioch, under Meletius's presidency, and accepted the "Tome" or letter of a synod or synods under Damasus, which was strong against Macedonian, Apollinarian, and Marcellian errors. It dwelt on the practical result of belief in a mindless Saviour: "If manhood was

assumed in an imperfect state, then God's gift is imperfect, and our salvation is imperfect because the whole of man is not saved." Again, the Holy Spirit was to be "venerated with the Father and the Son as perfect in majesty and deity;" and the Word of God was not "put forth" like an attribute, but born as eternally subsistent (or personal). The document referred to by the Council held at Constantinople in 382 as "the Tome made at Antioch" (see p. 452) apparently dealt with similar subjects, and is perhaps only the Roman Tome under another name. Meletius was the first of the Eastern bishops to sign the Tome: next to him comes the name of Eusebius of Samosata. That good prelate, on his return from exile, employed himself (whether by direct commission from a Council, or as considering that the emergency dispensed with ordinary forms) in consecrating orthodox bishops for various churches. He stationed Acacius at Berœa, Theodotus at Hierapolis, Eusebius at Chalcis, Isidore at Euphratesian Cyrrhos—afterwards Theodoret's own see; it is said that he also appointed Eulogius to the see of Edessa, now vacated by the death of Barses; and later on, when visiting a little town called Dolicha—at that time, says Theodoret, much infected by Arianism—in order to install in its bishopric a man of high religious character named Maris, he gained, by a sudden and strange fate, the honours of a martyr in the Catholic cause. He had just passed within the gates, when a woman, fanatical in the Arian cause, threw down a tile from a housetop on the head of the obnoxious visitor: and this repetition of the deed of the female zealot of Thebez proved fatal to Eusebius, who closed his truly noble career by the characteristic demand—enforced, it is said, on his friends by an oath or solemn promise—that no penalty should ever be inflicted by legal process on the authoress of his death. This, says Tillemont, was "the end of his holy life, his many conflicts, his glorious labours." Meletius, on his part, appointed several new bishops: the learned, but, as was afterwards too well proved, the heterodox Diodore was raised to the see of Tarsus; John, the son of that deaconess Publia who had so boldly defied the wrath of Julian, was made bishop of Apamea; and Stephen, who had been his fellow-labourer in upholding the Catholic cause during persecution, and who combined "Hellenic" culture with theological erudition, was sent to preside at Germanicia over a people whose faith had been perverted by Eudoxius. "The expectations formed of him," says Theodoret, "were not disappointed: he turned the wolves into sheep," no doubt by

exhibiting Catholicism in combination with gentleness and charity. There were several instances of this happy combination; for Sozomen tells us that several of the bishops who had been restored from exile offered very conciliatory terms to the Arianizers who had superseded them. Eulalius of Amasea found that hardly fifty of his people had submitted to the authority of his successor. He went so far as to propose that the latter should be associated with him in the church, and even should take rank before him. The other scorned this extraordinary concession, and ere long found himself deserted even by his own scanty following.

The edict of toleration had emboldened certain Macedonians to assemble at Antioch in Caria, and pronounce for the Homoiousion as against the Homoousion. But others of the party drew closer the bonds that they had formed with the Catholic Church, and adhered to the settlement of the Council of Tyana.

The Macedonians proper were included in a list of more than twenty anathemas, which has been variously dated, but was certainly drawn up by a synod under Damasus—according to Puller, who dates it in 380, the fourth of his synods which dealt with doctrine. The other errors thus condemned were the Arian in all its forms, the Sabellian, the Photinian—described as a renewal of Ebionism,—the theory which (anticipating Nestorianism) asserted two Sons, the Apollinarian, and the Marcellian; anathemas also were levelled at the notion which would ascribe Christ's sufferings to His Godhead, at the denial of His true bodily session at the Father's right hand, at every form of anti-Trinitarianism, at all Tritheism—at everything, in short, which could savour of heresy on the truth enshrined in the baptismal formula. The thirteenth of these is apparently the original of the twelfth of the famous "articles" of Cyril of Alexandria in 430: it affirms that the Word suffered, and tasted death in flesh, and became firstfruits from the dead in so far as He is life and life-giving as being God. "This then," the document concludes, "is the salvation of Christians, that we believing in and being baptized into the Trinity, that is, the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, should undoubtingly believe It to possess the one, true, and only Godhead." Antipathy to Macedonianism was very apparent in this Roman document, which employed one anathema after another to emphasize the orthodox confession of a true, proper, indivisible, co-equal Triune Godhead. It was addressed to Paulinus; and there can be no doubt that this was Paulinus of Antioch. Theodoret's words, "to

bishop Paulinus who was at Thessalonica," have drawn down on him severe censure, as if he had attempted to conceal this recognition by Rome of Meletius's rival. But Valesius defends Theodoret from this obviously improbable charge, and observes that he can only mean that Paulinus was at that time staying in the capital of Macedonia.

The first day of 379 had witnessed the death of the greatest of Eastern bishops. The nineteenth day of that same January was signalised by the association of Theodosius, afterwards not unduly styled the Great, in the full imperial honours, and the committal of Thrace, Asia, and Egypt,—that is, of the whole realm of Valens,—to the government of this able Spaniard, whose father, only three years before, had been ignominiously and unrighteously put to death under the authority of the young Emperor, who now, "oppressed and distracted" even with the government of the West, had the wisdom to "select a hero and a statesman" as the successor of his unhappy uncle in the East, as the one man who seemed capable of saving or restoring what had been lost or imperilled by Valens. Gibbon thinks that all history can hardly "afford a similar example of an elevation at once so pure and so honourable." Gratian further made over what had been called the diocese of the Mœsias, afterwards divided into those of Dacia and Macedonia. This great territory formed the Eastern Illyricum, and included Greece. Illyricum proper—a single "diocese," at first called "of the Pannonias," and containing seven provinces—was retained as part of the Western dominion, and therein of the Italian prefecture. Thereupon Damasus, with true Roman tenacity of power, took steps for retaining a hold over the churches of Eastern Illyricum by appointing Ascholius, bishop of Thessalonica, his deputy for its ecclesiastical affairs. This relation between the two sees lasted for about a century, but it soon became rather nominal than effective: there was, as Duchesne observes, a natural attraction of Greeks and Macedonians to the Eastern capital; and Theodosius II. in 421 enacted that questions arising in Eastern-Illyrian churches should be settled by the synod of the "diocese," but not without the knowledge of the bishop of Constantinople." Theodosius I. was in his thirty-third year when he began that illustrious reign which, although darkened by some grievous shadows, was destined on the whole to lift his name above all others in the Christian imperial line.

CHAPTER XXI.

THE CATHOLIC REVIVAL AT CONSTANTINOPLE.

The first ecclesiastical event of importance which marked the reign of Theodosius was the revival of Catholic faith and worship at Constantinople. That capital had been in the possession of Arianism for some thirty years, ever since the final expulsion of the orthodox Paul. Heresy had acquired in the minds of many of the citizens a sort of prescriptive right; it was invested with the respectability of a long-established and traditional religion: as Hilary said years before of Eastern Arianism in general, "it had so long been taught as the truth that it had come to be taken for the truth;" and it was represented at Constantinople in a moderate and attractive form by a prelate who exhibited great aversion for Eunomian rationalism and "impiety," while at the same time the Eunomians had their own bishop, one Florentius. The Arians, says Gregory, bragged of possessing "theatres and hippodromes, palaces and porticoes, the pillar of Constantine, the surging populace, the senate of high-born men." There was a Catholic minority, "the mere relic of a flock, disorganized, without an overseer," shrunken and enfeebled under the persecution of Valens, and no longer animated by the courage which had been shown in the attempt to establish Evagrius as Catholic prelate of Constantinople after the death of Eudoxius in 370. However, this faithful remnant retained, as Gregory says, a thoroughgoing loyalty to Nicene doctrine, and thus constituted "a little seed of the breath of life" amid the wide-spreading "death" of fashionable heterodoxy. They would look with horror at the Arians who made the great Church of the Eternal Wisdom a stronghold and centre of heresy; at the fanatical Arian women who "outdid men themselves in activity for the cause of misbelief;" at the crowd of irreverent talkers who haunted the public places, and disturbed

even private supper-parties with a flood of incessant flippancies and sarcasms on the most sacred of all subjects: in the language of Gregory of Nyssa, "If you ask the price of a loaf, you are told that the Son is subject to the Father; if you ask whether a bath is ready, the answer is that the Son was made out of nothing." This was in perfect accordance with that intense disputatiousness which (as Athanasius, years before, had testified) led the Arians of Alexandria to question the very boys and women in the streets as to the singleness of the "Ingenerate," or the possibility of an "Eternal Son." The Thalia of Arius, written for the very purpose of popularising his denial of the Son's co-equality, had given the original impulse to this voluble profaneness; and wherever Arianism was dominant, this bad sign of its presence would hardly be wanting.

Could anything now be done for the reorganization of Catholic Christianity in the Eastern capital? This was a question anxiously considered by the leaders of Catholicism even before the death of St. Basil. If we can trust Gregory the presbyter, the biographer of Gregory Nazianzen, Basil had concurred with many other bishops, and with the faithful of Constantinople, in desiring his old friend Gregory Nazianzen to undertake the task. Yet this is improbable, for he had already had experience of the peculiarities which had defeated his plans for Sasima. One great gift Gregory had, and that the bishops expected to prove sufficient—his power as a preacher. He was at this time enjoying that retirement which, throughout his life, possessed for him so irresistible a charm, and which, as he had intimated in his "defence" for returning into Pontus after being ordained priest, was connected in him with a species of mysticism. His father was dead, and he had been living since 375 at Seleucia in Isauria, the city of the Semi-Arian Council of 359. But the call to Constantinople was addressed to him so urgently that he did not feel able to resist it. In his own language, he "went thither, not of his own free will, nor as offering himself to the work, after the fashion of many who were wont to leap eagerly into places of pre-eminence, but in obedience to a summons, or even yielding to pressure, and being guided by religious awe and by the Spirit." Or, as he says in his autobiographical poem, "It was the grace of the Spirit that sent me, by the summons of many pastors and flocks: thus I came, not willingly, but under the influence of men who constrained me;" and he intimates that he was expected to do good service, not only against the Arianism in its various forms, moderate and extreme, which prevailed in

Constantinople, but against the Apollinarian error which nullified the humanity of Christ, and against an opposite tendency to distinguish between the Son of God and the Son of the Virgin, as two persons—the same tendency which, as we have seen, had caused anxiety to Athanasius, and was to constitute the heresy of Nestorianism.

Thus Gregory, "thinking it better to suffer something in the flesh than to sustain injury in the spirit," and praying to have "the rough steep way made smooth for him," obeyed this unwelcome call, and went to Constantinople about the end of 379, fortified by letters of recognition from Peter of Alexandria, who, as he says in his poem, "honoured him with the tokens of establishment in his new dignity"—a phrase which Tillemont does not undertake to explain, but which probably indicated some vague and unwarranted claim of Alexandrian authority over the Church in "New Rome." The enterprise was an extremely bold one for a man of fifty, conspicuously deficient in practical and administrative ability, nervously reluctant to confront the society of a great capital, devoid alike of personal dignity and of colloquial agreeableness, accustomed to rustic seclusion, and, it is said, betraying his antecedents by a rough unpolished dialect. No adventitious resources had he, this poor-looking attenuated recluse with downcast melancholy face, shy and unsocial, penniless and meanly attired, who had come in simple loyalty to duty on this great errand of building up the ruined fabric of orthodoxy at Constantinople. He was welcomed by a niece and her husband to their own house, which was to him, he says, what the Shunammite's was to Elisha; and there the scanty band of Catholics had to assemble—not without peril from the intolerant bitterness of the Arians. This house became famous under the name of "the Anastasia"—the place of the resurrection of the Catholic faith: it stood in what was called the seventh quarter of the city, at some little distance from the western end of the Hippodrome. The congregation was organized, apparently, in April; and forthwith Gregory, as its chief, became a mark for popular denunciation on the part of Arians, who, posing as conservatives in possession, determined to put down the intrusive innovator. "He is denying the one God, and setting up more Gods than one." "They knew no better," was his comment: "they had never been taught that the Unity is triune, and the Trinity is one;" or as he says in one of his discourses, in language exactly reproduced in the "Quicunque"—"that the Unity is to

be worshipped (as existing) in a Trinity, and the Trinity (as) in a Unity." One of his first cares was to inculcate a great moral principle which was daily and hourly outraged by the disputatious rationalism of the Ultra-Arians—the principle of reverence in the treatment of Divine truth. Of such reverence, and withal of the single-minded devotion to religious interests which alone could then, or at any time, give real vitality to a religious teacher's work, he himself was a consistent and conspicuous example. "One must purify oneself," said he in one of his earlier sermons delivered in the Anastasia, "before one holds converse with Him who is pure." "I wish it may befall me neither to think nor to speak, concerning God, anything that is my own." "Ascend by holiness of life, if thou desirest to become a theologian; keep the commandments, for action is the step to contemplation: even Paul confessed that he could only see through a mirror and dimly." When he spoke of the great doctrine which he had come to preach —the mystery of the Trinity—he had to guard against the Sabellian "confusion" and the Arian "severance," against that false kind of Monotheism which would make the Trinity "merely nominal," and that "Judaizing" error which would confine Deity to the Unbegotten Father, or that other which would constitute three independent principles or three separate Gods: it was necessary to secure what of old was called the "Monarchia" by referring the Son and the Spirit to the Father as causative Principle; and at the same time to exclude any confusion of the three "hypostases" or "persons," and to insist on the reality of the Unity as existing in Trinity—of the "one glory in three brightnesses." But he was also most earnest in protesting against any attempts to measure the divine Sonship by earthly standards, to rationalise as to the "procession" of the Spirit—in short, to ask unbefittingly "*How?*" And whatever he said to his people on this fundamental mystery was pervaded and illuminated not only by the reverent caution which discouraged all attempts to comprehend the Infinite, to grasp the supreme essence in a formula, but by the adoring devotion of one whose spirit lived on the truths which he was defending, and by the profound conviction of their practical bearing upon life. The habit of his mind and the tone of his teaching on these points may be gathered from some vivid passages in his twenty-third sermon, particularly devoted as it was to the question of peace between different parties of Catholics, and written, in fact, after the "concordat" between the adherents of Paulinus and

Meletius had for the time restored peace to the Church of Antioch, and therefore to other Eastern Churches, in so far as they were affected by Antiochene quarrels. The discourse soon glides into the great theological subject which was always nearest his heart, and which his hearers seemed well disposed to entertain; and treats it, not with dry technical exactness, but with the glowing earnestness of a worshipping and obedient soul. "The Trinity, brethren, is a real Trinity, not a number of unequal elements. To dishonour any one of the Three, or to separate one from another, is to dishonour our confession, our regeneration, and our hope." "To serve the Trinity well," he says, as if anticipating the "cui servire regnare" of the collect, "is to rise above service. O holy, adorable, long-suffering Trinity! O Trinity, one day to be known by all, either for illumination or for punishment! Mayest Thou accept as worshippers those who now insult Thee, and may *we* lose none of them, even of the least!" This fervid charity was another point in Gregory which contributed much to his success in the work of "resuscitating" orthodoxy. He taught an inestimable lesson to theologians of all time by abstaining from everything like fierce invective: he did not, like some dogmatic zealots—to use his own significant words—"conceal argumentative weakness under overbearing declamation;" he strove to "show himself to be fighting in Christ's cause by fighting in Christ's way," by imitating Him "who was peace-making and gentle;" and at the same time he avoided that false and un-Christlike softness which would buy the reputation of good-nature by sacrificing sacred truth. He spoke "gently and earnestly, not with bitterness," remembering that "argument and imperiousness could not go together;" he appeared as the champion of a doctrine that was "sympathetic and tender;" he overcame by the power of persuasion.

Such was Gregory in the Church of the Anastasia. He describes it in his "Dream," where he speaks of himself as occupying the episcopal seat, as in the apse of a basilica, with presbyters sitting below him on either hand, and deacons "in shining vestments, symbolic of the splendour of angels," standing in their due place, while the congregation pressed as near as they could to the chancel screen. His exhortations repeatedly enforced the combination of practical religious earnestness—devotion, abstinence, almsgiving, and watchfulness against evil temper and sensuality—with the maintenance of Trinitarian faith; and his personal life, characterized by an absolute unworldliness, a genuine simplicity and

spirituality, such as few bishops, perhaps, of that time had equalled, enforced his teaching by the exhibition of that thorough consistency which alone could secure its moral force. "Never," said Rufinus, "had been known a life more holy and unblamable, or eloquence more vivid and brilliant, or faith more pure and orthodox, or knowledge more perfect and entire." Thus it was that, as he says, men came to him as thirsty travellers to a spring of water; the Church of Constantinople, but lately so scanty and so weak—so that it might be compared to a mere "handful"—rapidly grew under his care, spreading out to the right hand and to the left, until the measure of Divine benignity in its restoration exceeded the measure of its previous abasement.

But it was not likely that such a work as this would be allowed to go on unmolested. Several who heard Gregory preach were but the more embittered against Catholicism. From denouncing him as a Tritheist, the Arian party proceeded to violent interruptions of the services of the Anastasia. The bishop was pelted in the streets: at a great solemnity which seems to have been the Whitsun-eve baptism of 379, a brutal mob, including not only "beggars," or some of the lowest of the people, but Arian monks, and women "like so many furies," who had issued from the cathedral itself, burst into the temporary church while Gregory was officiating, "insulted the mysteries," and threw stones at those who were, as he says, "being initiated" (that is, who were on the point of being baptized), while Gregory stood between them and the ruffians. They set their leader, whom Gregory calls their Corybantian, on the episcopal seat. Other injuries were added to these; a zealous member of his flock was beaten through the city and left for dead. Gregory himself was accused before the magistrates, whom he depicts as scowling superciliously at the representative of an unpopular religion. His quiet firmness and gentleness apparently disarmed his assailants; they fell back, it would seem, on satire and affected scorn. "Look at his bald head, his melancholy face, his worn-out garments—what a poor-looking vulgar fellow he is, how unfit for city life, how spiritless, how incapable!" Such sneers would have some effect in a luxurious and arrogant society. Gregory could only repel them by the dignity of his own single-minded earnestness, and indulge the hope that if his flock were small, it would ere long be increased by the conversion of some of the "wolves" outside it into "sheep." He had, for a time, some trouble in consequence of the Antiochene

dissensions, which enrolled the Catholics of Constantinople under opposite party-standards, while he himself was impartial as to the two claimants; and when this evil was abated by the accommodation above mentioned, a different peril arose in 380 from the intrigues of an adventurer named Maximus, who, professing to be a zealous Christian, and even to have been a confessor for the faith in Egypt, while retaining the garb of a Cynic philosopher—the fact being that he had been scourged for misconduct—came to Constantinople with a design of securing the episcopate. Gregory, who was like a child in knowledge of the world, and who owns that he "often made like mistakes," was easily taken in by the man's pretended earnestness, and actually panegyrised him in a sermon with grotesque reference to his philosophic profession as "a dog, not in impudence, but in boldness." There must have been in him a good deal of rascally cleverness, for he afterwards imposed even upon Ambrose. No wonder then that the simplicity of Gregory, who had received Maximus into his house, and treated him with confidence as well as kindness, was scandalously abused: one of his clergy (a barbarian by descent) lent his aid to the intrigue; and Peter of Alexandria himself, who must have been getting into his dotage, was persuaded to commission some bishops of Egypt to visit Constantinople and consecrate "the Cynic." One night, when Gregory was ill, the conspirators, who had hired the support of some Alexandrian sailors, forced entrance into the Anastasia, placed Maximus in the episcopal seat,—were compelled to evacuate the place as soon as the clergy became aware of the proceeding—and took Maximus to a mean house belonging to a flute-player, where they cut off his "yellow curling" false hair, and consecrated him a bishop. The result of this audacity was the compulsory departure of Maximus and his consecrators from Constantinople. He vainly endeavoured to obtain the countenance of Theodosius, then at Thessalonica; he was denounced, in a letter to Damasus, by Ascholius, bishop of that city (whom the Latins call Acholius), and Damasus treated him accordingly; and after attempting to intimidate the aged archbishop of Alexandria on whose credulity he had practised, but whose eyes were now opened, he was expelled by military authority from the capital of Egypt, and Peter lived long enough to assure Gregory of his friendship and communion. Meantime, Gregory, whose nature had a feminine element, had at first determined to retire from the city where he had received such a shock, and would have

carried out his intention but for the vehement remonstrances of persons of all classes, high and low, magistrates and soldiers, "on fire alike with anger and affection." They crowded the Anastasia, insisting that he should promise not to go: he was silent, but they declared that they would not depart, in spite of the heat and pressure, until he gave them some assurance. "If you leave the city," said one of them, "you will cast out of it, at the same time, the faith of the Trinity." At length, as the evening was closing in, Gregory so far yielded as to promise that he would stay until the expected arrival of some bishops. In fact, he did retire for a short time to a place on the seashore, and then returned to the city in renewed strength and spirits, and delivered a discourse which began with the emphatic words, "I longed for you, my children, and I know that you longed as earnestly for me."

But the time was now at hand at which the Catholics of the Eastern empire were to have their day of triumph, under the auspices of a vigorous sovereign devoted, with personal zeal and thoroughgoing sympathy, to the cause which had for years been struggling against the hostility of an imperial court. Gratian had, on the 3rd of August, 379, cancelled his recent edict of toleration, and re-enforced all the provisions which had formerly been made in favour of "the Catholic observance." And Theodosius, after having received baptism, during a dangerous illness, from the bishop of Thessalonica, whose orthodoxy he had in the first instance ascertained, addressed to the people of Constantinople the memorable edict, *Cunctos populos*, dated at Thessalonica on the 28th of February, 380. "We will," wrote the Emperor, in the high Cæsarean strain to which Constantine had given an impulse, "that all peoples governed by our Clemency shall live in that religion which the holy apostle Peter delivered to the Romans, as is proved by the religion handed down to the present time on his authority, and which is evidently followed by the pontiff Damasus, and by Peter, bishop of Alexandria, a man of apostolical holiness; to the effect that, according to the Apostolic teaching and the Evangelical doctrine, we believe the one Godhead of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, under" (*i.e.* existing in) "an equal majesty and under a sacred Trinity: we command that those who follow this law" (or religion) "shall bear the name of Catholic Christians; but that the rest, whom we regard as mad and frenzied, shall be loaded with the opprobrious name of heretics, and that their conventicles shall not take the name of churches; and they

are to be smitten, first by Divine vengeance, and afterwards by punishment proceeding from our action, which we shall have taken under the Heavenly will." It has been thought that Peter of Alexandria had died a few days before the issuing of this edict; but Ambrose, writing his work "On the Holy Spirit" in 381, supposes him to be still living, and would certainly have been informed if he had been succeeded by Timothy in the February of 380. Moreover, if the affair of Maximus is assigned to 380, time must be allowed for Peter to renew his friendly relations with Gregory; hence his death may confidently be fixed on Feb. 14 of the next year, 381. On the same day with his great edict, Theodosius made a law against the promotion to bishoprics of men ignorant or negligent. He remained at Thessalonica until August, and Zosimus connects his stay there with a needless increase in the number of military officers and a development of courtly extravagance. He then proceeded to Hadrianople, and arrived at Constantinople on the 24th of November, 380.

Gregory in opposing the Ultra-Arians during the summer of this year had become acquainted with an "introductory" manual intended to prime their followers with argumentative points, and had inaugurated the series of his five great "Theological" Discourses. In the first two of these he contends, somewhat in Butler's manner, for the absolute necessity of "seriousness" in the treatment of a subject so sacred: he urges that flippant "talk," misnamed "speculation," is precisely *not* the way to truth; that God can indeed be known to exist from all eternity, and apart from all limitations, and that nature testifies to His creative and providential agency, but to affirm this is not to fathom the depths of His infinite being, nor to see Him as He is; that a "comprehension" of God may be attainable in a higher state of being, but that in this life all that can reach us is but as "a little ray from a vast body of light;" and thus that the "knowledge of God," ascribed in Scripture to His holy servants, is but a relative and comparative illumination, even as a Paul could only say, "It is in part that we know." In the third discourse he proceeds to guard the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity from misconstruction, by exhibiting its agreement with the primæval belief in the Divine Unity; to insist on the real eternity of the existence of the Son and the Spirit, without prejudice to their dependence on the Father as Origin or Principle; to consider certain Eunomian objections, as that co-eternity would imply "uncausedness" and co-essentiality

"unbegottenness;" to retort on Eunomians that on their showing the human soul would either have no beginning or be imperfect, and that a titular deity is, as such, unreal; to adduce Scriptural texts for the Son's Godhead, and to deal with Arian arguments from other texts, which refer for the most part to the condescension and to the self-limitations involved in it. The subject is continued in the fourth discourse; and it is observable that Gregory explains Mark xiii. 32 as referring to "the manhood," but is not satisfied with that explanation in regard to John xiv. 28, and reduces Matt. xxvii. 46 and Heb. v. 8—very unsatisfactorily—to representations of the general case of men. Here and there he uses phrases which of themselves might be construed in a "Nestorian" or in a "Eutychian" sense, but his general meaning is abundantly clear: he sets forth the combination of Godhead and Manhood in Him who, in becoming Incarnate, "remained what He was, but took to Himself what He was not" (a phrase which, in later forms, became a commonplace with St. Augustine); Him who, while lying in the manger, was still, as always, glorified by the angels; who was baptized as man, but "loosed" our sins as God; who asked, as man, where Lazarus was laid, but, as being God, raised him up; who died, but gave life, and by His death destroyed death. In the fifth of these discourses he had attacked not only the Macedonian heresy, which, while fairly sound as to the Son, objected to the divinity of the Spirit as introducing a strange God, but the notion which reduced the Holy Spirit to a mere impersonal energy of God, and also any inadequate recognition of His proper Deity: for, unlike Basil, and probably taught by experience of what had resulted from Basil's reserve on this point, Gregory expressly called the Spirit "God," and therefore "co-essential," and in reply to the argument that His Deity was not clearly expressed in Scripture, observed not only that several passages implied it, but that the full manifestation of it was intended to be a gradual work, following on the revelation of the divinity of the Son. It should be added that Gregory does not approach to the doctrine of the Double Procession, although (as we have seen) in several of his Trinitarian statements he almost anticipates the "Quicunque." He had followed up these discourses by a further warning against a contentious verbosity on sacred subjects, and an exhortation to speak but little, and that little very cautiously and modestly, on themes which taxed all the ability of trained theologians, compelled by their duty to break that silence which an adoring heart would

often prefer. While enforcing the distinction between teachers and taught, he pleads for a patient and modest consideration of the difficulties and anxieties of the former—"You do not know what a blessing it is not to be under the necessity of saying *something*;" and with an obvious allusion to the Eunomians, he likens the technicalities of Greek schools to one of the plagues of Egypt.

These addresses of Gregory's are matters of interest to students of Church history as well as of theology; for they doubtless contributed to the settlement of Church matters in Constantinople which followed on the arrival of Theodosius. The Emperor, in the first instance, sought to reunite the Christian communities of Constantinople by prevailing on Demophilus to accept the Nicene Creed, and thus combine his adherents with those of Gregory. "I cannot do it," said Demophilus. "Then," said the Emperor, "if you thus refuse to be united with the believers in the Nicene faith, I must order you to quit the houses of prayer." Demophilus assembled his flock in St. Sophia, and standing up in the midst of them, said, "Brethren, it is written in the Gospel, 'If they persecute you from this city, flee ye to another.' Since then the Emperor excludes us from the churches, I give notice that we will henceforth assemble outside the city." He acted on this resolution; and with him, says Socrates, there went out also Lucius—a much worse specimen of the Arian party than himself—who, after his abominable proceedings as Arian bishop at Alexandria, had fled to Constantinople when Peter's return made his position in Egypt untenable. These two Arians, we may observe, were named together by the Council of Aquileia in 381, in a letter to Theodosius, as having repeatedly harassed the Catholics of the East.

The departure of Demophilus, which finally closed the period of Arian ascendency at Constantinople, took place on the 26th of November, 380. The Arians probably chose for their place of meeting a suburb just outside the Wall of Constantine; while the Catholics were put in possession of the churches, according to the express promise of Theodosius to Gregory, "God gives the temple, by my means, to you and to your labours." Gregory was fully aware of the danger which he might incur from the resentment of the Arian population. Anxiety was mingled with his joy: he felt that even imperial favour and the strong hand of civil power might not be able to ensure him a peaceable entrance into the great church, which was now guarded by the imperial troops, in the face of an excited multitude, storming against the Catholic bishop as an

intruder, and passionately entreating that the Emperor would reconsider his resolution. He shows us "streets and public places filled with crowds thick as snowflakes, and restless as surging waves—eager faces, old and young, looking down from second and third stories—cries of grief and groans of anger blended in a chorus of popular protest: the city resembled one that had been suddenly captured." It was morning, but no brightness shone upon the military pomp that took its way, in steady orderly movement, towards the cathedral: the heavy November clouds, hiding the sun, deepened the sombre and menacing gloom which, to Catholic eyes, must have ushered in the day of Gregory's enthronement. He himself, weak and ill in body, hardly able, as he says, to breathe, moved on between the purple-clad Emperor and the guards, looking fixedly heavenwards, and doubtless absorbed in prayer. They entered the basilica, which, as Gregory afterwards said, was on that day turned from a Jebus into a Jerusalem; and he, with Theodosius, passed up the nave into the sanctuary. The service began: the Catholics united in a loud burst of psalmody, and intermingled with it, in the strange fashion of the day, enthusiastic exclamations and eager stretching out of hands; and then, as in a moment, the sky brightened, the sun came out in full splendour, and the church, from one end to another, was bathed in vivid light. The sudden brilliancy at such a moment, which Gregory compares to the "divine splendour that filled the ancient tabernacle," impressed great numbers of the people, as if it had been an actual sign of divine approval. With one of those rapid revolutions of feeling which have often been exhibited by Southern races, the popular voice now requested that Gregory should be enthroned as bishop. Men in office, men of the people, and women—"almost forgetting," says Gregory, "their womanly reserve"—joined in the "thunder," as he calls it, of this general demand. Gregory was too much agitated, and, even yet, too much alarmed, to speak: he had seen one man draw a sword as if to attack him, but almost immediately replace it in its scabbard. He asked one of the clergy to address a few words to the multitude. "Cease your clamour," exclaimed the bishop's mouthpiece: "for the present, our duty is to give thanks to God; weightier matters will come on in due time."

The scene terminated amid the plaudits of the people, who certainly had very different feelings from our own as to the reverence due to a sacred place: but this termination did not, in effect, abate all the exasperation which the ejection of Demophilus

had provoked. The Arians murmured under the pressure of the imperial mandate, "like Enceladus," in Gregory's quaint image, under the superincumbent weight of Etna; and "volcanic" outbreaks of wrath, occurring from time to time, had to be dealt with patiently and considerately. Gregory, in telling the story, asks those young and hot-headed zealots who blamed him for excessive lenity whether they would have had him employ against his opponents the resources of the civil power; whether it were better to "thrust out, drive away, infuriate, inflame" by an unsparing use of the strong arm of government, "or to heal with salutary medicines" the irritation which disappointment had naturally produced. He, for his part, could not doubt what was his duty. As he markedly avoided the path on which so many bishops had trodden—the path of courtiers and time-servers; as he shrank from contact with the incurably vicious class of palace-ministers, and came so seldom into the imperial presence that Theodosius longed for his visits as a rare enjoyment; as he held that persuasion rather than coercion was the method approved by God; so he did all he could to soothe the anxieties of those who were conscious of having opposed him, and won over by unexpected geniality and effective benevolence many who probably had expected very different treatment at his hands. He tells a memorable anecdote of a visit which was once paid to him during one of his frequent illnesses. Some of the people came to see him, and with them "a young man in mourning, with unshorn hair and pale face." Gregory lifted himself up from the bed. The others paid him some compliments, or expressions of respect and attachment, and withdrew. The youth stayed behind, threw himself on his knees, and clasped the feet of the bishop. "Who are you, and what do you want?" No answer came except loud weeping and passionate wringing of the hands. The tender-hearted Gregory felt his own tears come; one of his attendants forcibly removed the speechless visitor, and then said to the bishop, "That is the man who drew a sword against you; he has come to show his penitence." Gregory was overpowered: on recovering himself, he sent for the young man, and said to him, "God bless you; as He preserved my life, it is not much for me to feel kindly towards you! You now belong to me; strive to live worthily of God, and of me." The news of this scene produced a great effect in the city. Gregory had not as yet formally taken his seat as bishop *of* Constantinople: he did, indeed, very shortly after his first entrance into St. Sophia, address his people, in a joyous

and exulting strain, on their triumph over heresy; and ere long it seems that he was constrained by their fervid zeal and enthusiastic loyalty to ascend the throne, which he afterwards called "that perilous eminence, exposing its occupant to jealousy." He referred to this irregular enthronement in his thirty-sixth discourse —a sermon delivered about the middle or end of December, and apparently in the presence of Theodosius—of which a part was directed against the accusation of ambition, as if he had eagerly desired to obtain "this chair," whereas he should have been ashamed of any such feeling. On Christmas Day he poured out all his joy and devotion in a sermon on the Lord's "Nativity or Theophany," describing His Incarnation as an "emptying, to a slight extent, of His own glory:" he preached again on "the holy day of Lights," the Epiphany as we call it, which was observed in honour of Christ's baptism, and took occasion to censure the Novatian rigorism; and on the next day he delivered a discourse on Baptism, setting forth its benefits in all the splendour of his oratory as "a gift, unction, illumination, a laver, a seal," etc., and warning his hearers against the frequent abuse by which it was deferred until times of serious illness. In this elaborate discourse he referred to certain ceremonies used at baptism: for example, the neophyte, on emerging from the water, was made to stand in front of the sanctuary amid the chant of the psalms and the blaze of lights.

Of Gregory's administration in the months which followed his appointment we may gain some idea from his autobiographical verses, wherein he tells us that he could find no complete register of the revenues or the furniture of the church: he was advised to employ a "stranger," probably not an ecclesiastic, but a good man of business, as treasurer; but, for whatever reason, he refused. That under him the Catholic community grew from "a little one" into "a thousand," is attested not only by his own words, for instance by what he says about the clergy and the laity of all ages and both sexes whom he had gathered round him, but by Ambrose's remark in 381 as to the cleansing of spiritual leprosy in the city which had recently "fostered Arianism," but had now again "received the word of God." It would appear, from a recently discovered Arian account of a Council held at Aquileia and to be presently described, that Ulfilas and other Arian bishops repaired about this time to Constantinople, and made some representations to Theodosius in order to the assembling of a general Council, at which the whole question between Arians and Catholics should be reviewed. If, as

this narrative says, Theodosius gave them any promise, he was soon induced to draw back from it; the writer even says that he cancelled it by a decisive enactment, but it is probable that the Arians built too much on a few fair words. At any rate, the great edict of the 10th of January, 381, *Nullus hæreticis*, would overthrow any such hopes on their part. The opening clause was sufficiently explicit: "Let the heretics possess no place for celebrating their mysteries." Every concession obtained, as the Emperor chooses to say, "by fraud," is revoked. The Catholic faith as formulated at Nicæa is alone to be sanctioned, is to remain in perpetual observance. The "contamination of the Photinian pestilence, the poison of Arian sacrilegiousness, the crime of Eunomian misbelief," as they are described in the copious verbiage of imperial orthodoxy, were—as far as a legislator could effect it—to be "not so much as heard of again." A true Catholic was defined as one who confessed God Almighty, and Christ the One Son of God, by name—God of God, Light of Light: who did not insult, by denying, the Holy Spirit, through whom we receive that which we hope for from the Supreme Parent of all things; and in whose mind, by the perception of undefiled faith, there dwelt a sound belief in that undivided substance of the inviolable Trinity, which true believers, employing a Greek word, call "*ousia*." Those who did not accept this faith were to cease from their disingenuous assumption of the name of the True Religion, to which they had no title: they were to be debarred from entering the churches, and from holding meetings elsewhere than outside the towns; and if, in these circumstances, they made any factious outbreak, they were to be driven away "even from the city walls." The statement of Sozomen, that Theodosius forbade all discussions or meetings in the agora, refers of course to this law, and falls in with the complaint of Palladius that the Emperor, under the urgency of "heretics," forbade all disputation about the faith "whether in public or in private," as the text of his new law expressed it.

"It might have been wished," says Tillemont, "that Theodosius had found it as easy to restore peace and union to the Catholics as, by this law of January 10, to restore to them the churches which had been occupied by the Arians." The Western Church was, generally speaking, in the enjoyment of such peace, but in Spain there was an important exception. The strange phenomenon presented by what is known as Priscillianism takes us quite away from the atmosphere of the Arian controversy: we find Spanish

ecclesiastics and lay people exciting themselves for and against a weird "witch's caldron" of Manichean, Gnostic, and to some extent Sabellian or Photinian notions, scraps of this heresy and of that mixed up with astrological superstitions tending to fatalism, an unhealthy and un-Christian "asceticism," a false spiritualism which in effect set aside the Incarnation, and an unscrupulous readiness to disclaim or conceal opinions which, if avowed, might mean danger. An Egyptian, Marcus, had brought this medley of errors from Memphis; a lady named Agape, and a rhetorician named Elpidius, took it up eagerly, and communicated the new ideas to Priscillian, a man of birth and wealth, who is described by Sulpicius Severus (our main authority on the subject) as learned, eloquent, keen-witted, apt for discussion, skilful in persuasion, superior to all vulgar passions, but possessed, like Julian, with a morbid curiosity which orthodox Christianity refused to satiate. Many of his own class, and still more among the common people, were fascinated by this new mystic lore, as imparted by one whose attractiveness as a teacher was enhanced by his engaging manner and modest tone. He actually perverted two bishops, Instantius and Salvianus; but another, Idacius of Merida, opposed him with an intemperate zeal which did no service to orthodoxy. The controversy assumed serious dimensions: at last a Council met at Saragossa in the October of 380, which did not scruple to condemn the Priscillianists in the absence of their leaders, on such charges as deserting the churches at Christmastide, and going barefoot into the mountains, and fasting on Sundays from a heterodox motive. But Instantius and Salvianus were so far from being daunted by this ecclesiastical censure, that they proceeded to consecrate Priscillian as bishop of Avila; and their defiant attitude provoked the Spanish hierarchy to appoint one of its number to see its decrees carried out by aid of the secular power. This man, Ithacius, was a specimen of the worst type of heretic-hunters—an inquisitor without any redeeming virtue, rash to audacity, self-indulgent, a babbler, devoid of tact and prudence. He associated himself with Idacius, but surpassed him in headlong fury of zeal; and between them they induced the civil magistrates to expel the Priscillianists from cities, and procured from Gratian in 381 an edict banishing them from Spain. They took advantage of this edict to visit Rome and Milan, in the hope of obtaining ecclesiastical support. Priscillian addressed a treatise to Damasus, whom he calls "senior and first bishop," and also "your crown," and professed his faith in orthodox language,

such as, on the whole, characterizes the rest of his recently discovered writings, although here and there may be found in them expressions of a Sabellian or an Apollinarian colour. If they are to be treated as conveying his real mind, it would be unfair to regard him as theologically a heretic; but much was said against his party on the score of esoteric teaching which nullified their orthodox professions. Priscillian could gain nothing either at Rome or Milan; but he managed to set in motion the influences of Macedonius, Gratian's Master of the Offices, who procured from Gratian the recall of his sentence of banishment.

This was the extent of trouble in the Western Church; but the East was distracted not only by the numerous heretical sects, but by the divisions of Catholics themselves. Among these must still be reckoned the feud between the two parties at Antioch, which had been but superficially healed by the "accommodation" of 379; the agitation caused by the intrigues of Maximus at Constantinople; and the opposition encountered by Timothy, the new bishop of Alexandria. Yet these troubles were not so painfully felt by Theodosius and his ecclesiastical advisers as the obstinate vitality of Arianism among numerous Eastern Christians, the wide-spreading diffusion, in popular forms, of the opposite heresy of Apollinaris, and the disappointment of hopes which had once been entertained as to the absorption of the Macedonian party into the Church. In order to provide some remedy for these evils, and to effect a permanent settlement as to the episcopate of Constantinople, which Gregory had but provisionally accepted, Theodosius resolved to assemble a great Council of Eastern prelates in that city; and this was, in fact, the occasion of the meeting of what has since been regarded as the Second Œcumenical Synod.

CHAPTER XXII.

THE "SECOND GENERAL COUNCIL."

THE Council of Constantinople met, it appears, some time after the Easter of 381, which fell on the 28th of March; for Socrates says that the bishops were assembled in the month of May. There were but 150 Catholic prelates present: of these, the most eminent were Meletius; Timothy, the new archbishop of Alexandria; Cyril of Jerusalem, who had returned from his third exile at the accession of Gratian, and who now explicitly confessed the Homoousion which he had all along, or at least for years, virtually accepted; his nephew Gelasius, who now held the metropolitan see of Cæsarea; Helladius of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, the successor of Basil; Eulogius of Edessa; Amphilochius of Iconium; Gregory of Nyssa; Acacius of Bercœa in Syria; Diodore of Tarsus; Ascholius of Thessalonica,—with Gregory Nazianzen. But some of these, as the bishops from Egypt and Macedonia, appear to have come later than others: Gregory Nazianzen's account would seem to imply that they did not arrive until pressing messages had been sent to them by the Council. In the hope of accomplishing the work which had been begun in the last year of pope Liberius, and had been interrupted by the failure of the plan for a Council of Tarsus, thirty-six bishops belonging to the party of Macedonius—chiefly from the Hellespontine towns—were invited to the Council.

The place of president was assigned to Meletius, who, according to Socrates and Sozomen, had arrived at Constantinople before the rest, in order to assist at the settlement of Gregory in that see; but this, as Tillemont remarks, is an exaggeration, or misstatement, of the fact that Meletius's action in that matter took place before the arrival of the bishops from Egypt and Macedonia. According to Theodoret, the Emperor Theodosius, without being told which of the bishops presented to him was Meletius, at once singled him out

as the person whose likeness, in a dream, had seemed to invest him in imperial robes, and to place a crown upon his head. He kissed the bishop's eyes, lips, bosom, and head, as a son after long separation might greet a father. But he addressed the other prelates also in terms of filial respect, and exhorted them to proceed to business, and, in the first place, to settle the Church affairs of Constantinople. The inquiry into the pretensions of Maximus was not difficult. It was resolved that his consecration, and all ordinations performed by him, should be treated as null and void; and this resolution became eventually the fourth canon of the Council. Gregory was now, at last, in the most formal and fully ecclesiastical manner, established as bishop *of* Constantinople; he himself says that the only reason he had for satisfaction in this appointment was that, in his usual hopeful strain, he "thought that he might be thus enabled to unite discordant parties, to be a choragus to bring two choirs together."

This was the last Church act of Meletius, for he died very soon afterwards, having earnestly exhorted his brethren to labour for the Church's peace. Gregory of Nyssa preached his funeral sermon: it began by describing the departed prelate as a new apostle just added to the apostolic company, and then descanted on the bereavement of the Church at a crisis which loudly called for a "counsellor" and a "healer." "But lately," said the preacher, alluding to his namesake's installation, "we were singing as it were a nuptial song; to-day, we sing a dirge! We had," he continues, "in him that is gone, a firm pilot, and the anchorage of a steadfast judgment." His had been a presence singularly winning and lovable: "Where is now that sweet calm glance, that radiant smile on the lips, that cordial right hand, that used to move its fingers in unison with the blessing that flowed from the tongue!" This agrees with Nazianzen's estimate: "simple, artless, tranquil in look, inspiring at once confidence and reverence." Nor can he refrain from the obvious pun: "honey-like in conduct as in name." The funeral was stately and majestic: the Emperor left his throne to take part in it; the whole city went forth to escort the venerated remains on their homeward journey. Gregory Nyssen speaks of the vast crowd of people, "like a sea," surrounding the bier of Meletius, and the lights which, stretching in long lines as far as the eye could reach, seemed like rivers of fire. And as the corpse, after being borne across into Asia, passed from town to town, psalms were chanted, and an observance which Sozomen marks as

contrary to the Roman custom added a signal distinction to these obsequies; for, by special imperial orders, it was received within the various cities on its way. One of John Chrysostom's sermons, devoted to the praises of Meletius, expresses his own recollection of the day on which the remains of the prelate who, a few months before, had ordained him deacon, were received by the Antiochenes, whose loyal affection had been so long attracted and secured by the beauty of Meletius's character, that they called their sons by his name, and put his likeness on seals, on rings, on cups, on the walls of their rooms. The city, he tells us, sent up one cry of grief. His grave was made beside the tomb of one of his predecessors, St. Babylas, "in the church which he had himself recently erected in honour of that holy martyr on the bank of the Orontes."

There is one fact of great significance which must not be overlooked in connection with the death of this famous prelate. He died as a saintly man revered by the great majority of Eastern Churchmen, but outside the communion of the Western Church and the Roman see; for the West, and Rome in particular, unswervingly recognised Paulinus as bishop *of* Antioch, and therefore could not but regard Meletius, whatever might be his personal merits, as a schismatical pretender to the see. Even those who, like the bishops that met at Milan in the early summer of 381, were beguiled by the pretensions of Maximus, would be as resolute in disowning Meletius as any "Eustathian" who looked on Paulinus as his pastor.

The death of Meletius ought certainly to have healed the Antiochene divisions. There was a distinct compact, as we have seen, actually established, to the effect that the survivor of the two rival bishops should be acknowledged by both parties as the legitimate possessor of the see. Now was the time for this arrangement to be carried out. But not such was the opinion of several bishops who took an active part in the Council of Constantinople. They had been partisans of Meletius; they had an invincible aversion to Paulinus. They proposed that, the concordat notwithstanding, a new prelate should be appointed for Antioch. Gregory Nazianzen threw all his energy into the opposite scale: highly as he had esteemed Meletius, he was indignant at the notion of violating the concordat, and dismayed at the prospect of a perpetuated schism. When these bishops, therefore, requested his concurrence in their design, he answered by a vigorous remonstrance. "So long," he said, "as Meletius lived, and might be regarded with unfriendly

eyes by the Westerns, who treat his appointment as originally uncanonical, it was right for us to support him, even at the cost of giving some annoyance to them. But now he is gone, there is no further call to guard his interests; and, in my judgment, there is no further doubt as to our duty. We must recognise Paulinus as the true bishop of Antioch. He is an old man; in the natural course of things he cannot live much longer, and when he is called away to the rest which he has long desired, then we can hold a fresh election with the concurrent voices of bishops and people, and give to the see another occupant. This is the only solution of the difficulty. It will probably conciliate the Westerns, now estranged from us by their connexion with Paulinus; it will, at least, as the next best, give peace to the 'wearied' Church of the great Syrian capital. Observe what certain peril to the faith itself is involved in the continuance of the schism. And if it costs any of us something to acquiesce in the episcopate of Paulinus, let us make that sacrifice for the sake of a great religious gain. Let us be overcome to a slight extent, that we may win a greater victory in the end. If any one suspects *me* of corrupt or ambitious motives in regard to this proposal, all I can say is that I appeal to the future Divine judgment, and that I would gladly be free of the burden of the episcopate, and permitted to live in tranquil privacy. Deliberate on the matter: I have now said my say." But racial feeling silenced counsels of peace. The younger bishops, whom Gregory bitterly compares to a flight of crows, to geese or cranes in a quarrel, to a whirlwind raising a cloud of dust, to a swarm of wasps darting against a traveller's face, insisted that to accept Paulinus would be to give a triumph to the West, whereas the East, where Christ had appeared, had an intrinsic right to the ascendency. Such an argument, Gregory assures us, was actually used, as if men had forgotten that it might be retorted "The East was the land where Christ was slain!" and it also implied a forgetfulness that Egypt, Arabia, and Cyprus were ranged with the West in this question. Graver and elder bishops followed the lead of those hot-headed juniors whom they ought rather to have corrected. Some who called themselves "moderate men," and had no strong convictions, allowed themselves to be drawn into this extreme of partisanship; and it was resolved that a new appointment should be made at Antioch, as if for a duly vacated see. The person recommended, and ultimately consecrated at Antioch after the close of the Council, was Flavian,

who, if the story of Socrates and Sozomen be true, was one of those ecclesiastics of Antioch who had bound themselves not to come forward as candidates for the bishopric: he was elected by the suffragans of Antioch, and doubtless much was said in favour of his elevation by those who could tell how, in the days of Leontius, he, as a layman, had stimulated the devotion and upheld the faith of Antiochene Churchmen, and how, when Meletius was in exile under Valens, Flavian "the presbyter" had furnished the orthodox cause at Antioch with a long array of Scriptural arguments. As Theodoret says, Flavian was eulogized by the bishops as "illustrious for his labours, and for perils encountered in the cause of the flock."

Yet the election was unquestionably an error; and it inflicted on Gregory a disappointment which revived, or rather intensified, all his dislike of the office which he had accepted in the hope of becoming an instrument of peace. He was, he says, fortunate for a time in being detained at home by an attack of illness: he was then beset by urgent entreaties that he would still act with the other bishops. Afterwards he changed his residence from the episcopal house to another lodging, and gave indications of his intentions, or his wishes, sufficient to excite alarm in the minds of his affectionate adherents, who besought him, with tears, not to think of abandoning them, after so rich a blessing had attended his ministry as their pastor. He was touched, but unshaken: he also felt that those bishops who urged him to remain wanted to have his sanction for their own proceedings; and an incident now occurred to facilitate his plan of abdication. Timothy of Alexandria, and other Egyptian bishops, who had either not been summoned in the first instance, or had, since Meletius's death, been invited a second time, and more pressingly, to attend the Council, now arrived; there came, too, the bishops of Macedonia, who acted with them and against the Eastern bishops. These new-comers immediately declared war, so to speak, against the majority of the Council; and they found an engine for this attack in a technical objection to the appointment of Gregory as bishop of Constantinople. They privately assured Gregory that they had no personal objection to him: but they urged what Rufinus calls invalid reasons against the regularity of his elevation, invoking, as Gregory himself describes it, the authority of obsolete canons against what they represented as his "translation"—an incorrect phrase for his appointment, since he had never acted as bishop of Sasima, nor ever held the see of Nazianzus; and Theodoret adds that Meletius, when

he acted in the matter, was well aware of the real "aim" of the old Church legislators, who in prohibiting episcopal translations had intended to frustrate episcopal ambition. However, the objection was put forward; it could not be denied that Gregory had received consecration when Basil meant him to live at Sasima; and the feud between the new-comers and the majority became serious, when Gregory, "seizing" as it were on an "opportunity" for making good his retreat, reappeared in the Council, and entreated the disputants to accept the means of reunion which he was only too glad to offer. "Brethren, God has at last brought you together; do not contend with each other on my account; let me be like Jonah, —cast me into the sea, and it will be calm to you! I was most unwilling to ascend this throne, and most gladly do I resign it: my only anxiety is, that the faith of the Trinity may be upheld. Farewell, and remember my labours."

This was Gregory's celebrated Resignation: Sozomen thinks it the most signal proof of what he calls the "wisdom" of one who thus modestly and unselfishly "resigned the deposit" of the bishopric into the hands of his brethren, without a word as to the perils and endurances which it had involved. Tillemont exaggerates it into an eminent instance of heroism; but it must be remembered that Gregory was all along conscious of peculiarities of character which made him "unequal to the government of the church and province of Constantinople," and which were urged by critics and censors as reasons for desiring or accepting his retirement. He was advanced in years, sickly in body, weary of a public life, ill qualified to bear its burdens; he had not been able to cope with all the requirements of such a bishopric; he had not, as he somewhat sarcastically expressed it, "known that he would have to vie with consuls and prefects" in state and splendour, or to make an impression, outside the church walls, on the population of an imperial city. His very gentleness was brought up against him by angry partisans of Catholicism, who complained that he had not used his position so as to give them vengeance on their former oppressors.

For various reasons Gregory might feel that his work at Constantinople was now done. Yet he admits that he felt a certain sorrow when he thought of those whom he had so heartily loved and striven to guide in the right path. What would now become of them? He must leave that to God. He repaired to the Emperor's presence, but did not stoop to any undignified

entreaties: in the presence of many courtiers, he asked, as he says, not for "gold nor glistening tablets, nor coverings for the table of the Mysteries," or high preferment for any of his kindred, but simply for permission to "yield to jealousy." "I am weary of incurring odium even with friends, because I cannot look to anything save God." Theodosius, he says, in the presence of his court applauded this address: he was naturally reluctant to lose Gregory, but he did not refuse the desired permission. Of the Church-people, as Gregory tells us, the general feeling was very averse to his departure: among the bishops of the Council, some were unequivocally glad to get rid of a man whose unworldly sanctity was uncongenial to their taste, or whose counsels as to the see of Antioch had galled their party feeling; but others were thunderstruck at the prospect of his departure, and "stopped their ears and struck their hands together," in token of their repugnance to seeing any other person installed in his place. To such prelates as these, and to his clergy and laity, he specially addressed himself in his celebrated farewell sermon—the 42nd of his orations—delivered in St. Sophia, about the close of June, 381. The whole Council was present, and its members must have listened with very mixed feelings to this brilliant and impressive discourse, which began with a significant reference to the unfriendly treatment he had received. "Do you now understand? are you become kinder judges of my case?" He then gave a summary of his work at Constantinople, and contrasted the present with the past condition of Church interests in the capital. The little drop of Catholicism had swollen into a river; the spark had become a torch flaring up skyward; the grain of mustard-seed had grown into a tree, the handful into a crop; the flock was in good condition and gradually increasing. Surely it was a great thing to have "consolidated by sound doctrine a city to which the extremities of the world converge, and from which they start as from a common mart of the faith:" words which, while they resemble a Gothic king's comparison of the New Rome to a fountain fed by many rivulets, clearly point to what it had become religiously, in so far as it was now orthodox—a central point to which visitors brought Catholic ideas, and also from which they carried them back. He briefly stated his belief as to the Trinity, pointing out, much in the spirit of the Alexandrian Council, the essential agreement between the asserters of three "hypostases" and of three "prosopa," and protesting, in Samuel's tone, that his administration had been free

from self-seeking and high-handedness. And then he formally requested leave to depart. "Show some respect to my grey hairs. Choose another bishop," he proceeds in that tone of suppressed bitterness which recent vexations made natural to his sensitive temper—"another who can be persecuted for you; who can gratify you in all things!" He dwelt on the quarrels between different bishops, Eastern and Western; asked how long such terms as "mine and thine," "old and new," "more eloquent" or "more spiritual," would disturb the peace of brethren; compared these ecclesiastical contests to those of the circus and theatre (a comparison the most disparaging that he could think of); alluded to the criticisms passed on himself as too gentle towards opponents, too simple in personal habits, unfit to represent the Church in its majesty; and then besought them again, with deeper solemnity and earnestness, yet not without a touch of soreness, to "grant him his papers of dismissal, with or without certificate of good conduct," and suggested that they should set one in his place who would not try to please everybody in everything, but be willing to offend some in the cause of right. He ended with a farewell which even Gibbon describes as "pathetic and almost sublime." "Farewell" to the Anastasia, that new Shiloh—to the great temple, his new inheritance, in which they were assembled—to the churches which linked the other regions of the city to the cathedral; to the relics of the apostles in the church bearing their name; to the episcopal seat, the body of clergy, the monastic or "Nazarite" communities, the widows, the orphans, the poor; to the households which for Christ's sake had tended his infirmities; to the audiences which had pressed up to the very chancel-gates when he preached, with writing materials (here comes in a touch of self-complacency) sometimes concealed and sometimes displayed; to the Emperor, to the palace and its train of servants, whether faithful to their master or not, he did not profess to know, but he did know (here the rapier seems to flash out) that for the most part they were unfaithful to God; to the great Christian city whose citizens might well be urged to serve God more earnestly and more intelligently; to the East and to the West, in the cause of which, and by which, he was alternately assailed, which he had striven to reconcile, which perhaps could be reconciled if others would imitate his abdication: "for those who quit their thrones do not lose their God, but will rather secure a higher throne in heaven." Finally, after bidding farewell to the "Angel-guardians of this church," and praying that

the Holy Trinity might be therein continually acknowledged and increasingly worshipped, he exhorted the people whom he tenderly described as still his own—"My dear children, keep, I pray you, the deposit; remember how I was stoned: the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all!"

So ended Gregory Nazianzen's public life. He quitted Constantinople immediately afterwards; and it became necessary to elect his successor. That successor was found in an elderly man of high birth and winning manners, who held the rank of a prætor, but who was still unbaptized when elected, or rather, it is said, selected by Theodosius, perhaps under the influence of Diodore of Tarsus, from a list of persons suggested to him by the bishops. His name was Nectarius. In early life, he had been stained by some immoralities; but they had not been sins against Christian grace, and were not regarded as hindrances to his elevation. There were serious remonstrances against this choice—remonstrances justified by the subsequent laxity of Nectarius's episcopal administration; and Tillemont, who speaks of him severely, is indignant with Sozomen for seeing in the circumstances of his appointment a special mark of Divine approval. Undoubtedly his case was very different from that of Ambrose; the rule against appointing "neophytes" could hardly have been superseded in his favour by any solid proof of merit. Yet he was probably acceptable—by his very unlikeness to the "austere, unsocial" Gregory, by his suavity of address and dignity of bearing, and by his "senatorial" blood—to large classes of the people, who, if Socrates was well informed, insisted vehemently on having him for their bishop. They were gratified; Nectarius was baptized, and consecrated in his white baptismal garments—the whole synod ultimately concurring in his appointment (although some of its members had, as we have seen, at first protested against it as a manifest breach of rule), and "the whole clergy and people signifying their acquiescence." It did not turn out very well.

The Council now proceeded to the doctrinal business which lay before it. The hopes which had been entertained, as to an absorption of the Macedonian sect or party into the Church, were found fruitless; its leaders, who had been invited to the Council, persistently refused to abandon their peculiar position, retired to their own homes, and encouraged their followers, by circular letters, to hold out. The "hundred and fifty" orthodox prelates drew up, we are told, in the first instance, a "Tome" or doctrinal statement,

involving a "more expanded confession of the faith," part of which was evidently devoted to the condemnation of Apollinarianism; for, says the address of the Council of Chalcedon to the Emperor Marcian, "those who in this city," meaning Constantinople, "exposed the pestilent doctrine of Apollinaris, made known their decision to the Westerns." A remnant of this Tome apparently exists in the "first canon of Constantinople," which, confirming the Nicene Creed, condemns every heresy, and specially (1) the "Eunomian or Anomœan;" (2) the "Arian" (as distinct from Ultra-Arian) or "Eudoxian"—the Homœan or Acacian form of Arianism; (3) the Semi-Arian, Macedonian, or "Pneumatomachist;" (4) the Sabellian, (5) Marcellian, (6) Photinian, and (7) Apollinarian errors. But when this "canon" speaks of retaining the Nicene Creed inviolate, is this to be understood of that altered form of creed which in the Council of Chalcedon was ascribed to that "of Constantinople," which, with one important Latin addition, we still use, and which was apparently, as Hefele thinks, the "quintessence" of the Tome? What can be ascertained as to the formation of this "Creed of Constantinople"?

In his book called "Ancoratus," written in 373, eight years before the Council, Epiphanius, after insisting on the necessity of an orthodox faith, presents as Nicene—or in his own words, as set forth by the 318—a formula nearly identical with the creed which we use at present; and adds a longer formulary to which (with strange laxity of statement) he assigns œcumenical authority, but which, for our purpose, we may ignore. The shorter "Epiphanian" creed differs from the original Nicene, and agrees with the creed of Jerusalem, as gathered from Cyril's Catechetical Lectures, in several respects. Cyril's creed has indeed some common points with the Nicene: for instance, "We believe in one God, Father Almighty, Maker of all things both visible and invisible, and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, Only-begotten, begotten of the Father" (here the order of words is different, and the Jerusalem creed has the article before "Only-begotten"), "Very (true) God," "through whom all things came into being," "was incarnate and made man," "rose (again) the third day," "ascended into the heavens," "is coming to judge (the) living and dead," "and in the" (Nicene) "one" (Jerusalem) "Holy Spirit." But the distinctively Jerusalem points are, that whereas in the Nicene "heaven and earth" come in with reference to the Son's agency in creation, the Jerusalem form mentions them in the first sentence,

with reference to the Father as Maker; it also describes the Son's Filiation as "before all the ages;" it speaks of Him as "crucified and buried" (omitting the "suffered" of the Nicene), and as having "sat down on the right hand of the Father;" it adds "in glory" to the mention of His second "coming;" and it affirms that of His "kingdom there shall be no end." It also adds to the belief in the Holy Spirit the description of Him as "the Paraclete," and as having "spoken through the prophets;" and it concludes, "And in one baptism of repentance unto remission of sins, and one holy Catholic Church, and in resurrection of flesh, and in life eternal."

Taking then the "shorter Epiphanian" creed, and supposing, as is reasonable, that Epiphanius had acquired it through his frequent intercourse with the Church of Palestine, we find that it agrees with Jerusalem as to "Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things," etc., "the Son of God, the Only-begotten, who was begotten of the Father before all the ages" (where the Nicene reads, "the Son of God begotten of the Father, Only-begotten, that is, from the essence of the Father"); as to "was crucified and was buried;" as to the "sitting at the Father's right hand" (but here the Jerusalem phrase, "sat down," is altered into "sitteth"), the "glory" of His second coming, the endlessness of His kingdom, the fact that the Holy Spirit spake through the prophets, the mention of baptism, but without "of repentance," the description of the Church as "one, holy, catholic," and the confession of resurrection (but "of dead persons," not "of flesh") and of life, but amplified into "life of the age to come," instead of "life eternal." Secondly, we observe that it agrees distinctively with the Nicene form in the following features: "that is, from the essence of the Father," "Light from Light," "*very God from very God*" (the Nicene "God from God" before "Light from Light," being omitted, evidently because the subsequent "very God from very God" covered it amply), "*begotten, not made*," "*coessential* with the Father," "who for us men and for our salvation came down," and "who suffered." Thirdly, there are several points in which this formula differs both from Nicæa and Jerusalem; as "from heaven," "(was incarnate)" "*of the Holy Spirit and Mary the Virgin*," "for us under Pontius Pilate," "according to the Scriptures," "again" before "cometh," "who proceedeth from the Father," "who is jointly worshipped and jointly glorified with Father and Son;" the addition of "Apostolic" as descriptive of the Church, and the alterations above mentioned in the articles of Resurrection and of Life.

On the whole, then, it is clear that this creed is a compilation from Jerusalem, Nicene, and other elements, evidently used to supply a safeguard against the Apollinarian denial of the human reality of our Lord's flesh. But what is the proper basis? Had Epiphanius any right—what is of more moment, have *we* any right—to treat it as "Nicene"? If we look at the document from a purely literary point of view, we must answer that its basis is the Jerusalem creed; for after reckoning up the distinctively Jerusalem elements and the distinctively Nicene, we find that the former decidedly outnumber the latter. But this does not settle the question. The elements which in this comparison are the fewer are much more critical and momentous than those which are more numerous. They contain what is the very pith and essence of Nicene belief, as it was understood in that century. The confession of a Son of God who was "begotten, not made," who was "very God from very God," and, above all, who was "from the Father's essence" and "coessential with the Father,"—this characteristically Nicene matter, introduced among the "Jerusalem" features, leavens the whole lump, and makes it in an effective sense Nicene. For in those days, to be "Homoousian" was to be "Nicene" to all intents and purposes; and when the Homoousion was deliberately retained and treated as indispensable, it would amply cover the true import of the Filiation, and therefore the explanatory clause of the original formula, "that is, of the essence of the Father," which was retained in the Epiphanian, might be omitted in the "Constantinopolitan" edition. No one can doubt that (as Mr. T. H. Bindley says in his "Œcumenical Documents of the Faith") the "Constantinopolitan," both in stateliness of rhythm and in fulness of doctrinal statement, is superior to the Nicene proper; but was it sanctioned by the "Second Œcumenical Council"? We have no contemporary evidence of the fact, which is first distinctly asserted by Flavian of Constantinople in 449 and at the Council of Chalcedon in 451, although there are indications that it was in vogue at Constantinople shortly before the Council of Ephesus. Four years before the Council of Constantinople, Basil, in writing to Epiphanius, had declined to express any opinion on additions made to the creed on the subject of the Incarnation, but had implicitly admitted that an addition might be desirable in order to the due "glorifying" of the Holy Spirit. But Gregory of Nazianzus, writing in the very next year after the Council of Constantinople, says distinctly that "we never have

preferred, nor can prefer, anything to the creed framed at Nicæa;" the Church of Constantinople, in correspondence with the African bishops in 419, recognised the original Nicene Creed, and sent a Latin version of it; the Council of Ephesus, guided by Cyril, recited the same original Nicene Creed, and prohibited any different creed from being framed as a test of orthodoxy; and even the "Oriental" or Antiochene party, for all their dislike of Cyril and his policy, agreed with him in professing the unaltered Nicene Creed. Again, even at Chalcedon, Egyptian bishops protested when a bishop in close relations with Constantinople referred to the creed before us as a "symbol of the holy fathers," and must have dissented at heart from the formal association of it, as the creed of "the 150 fathers," with the Nicene Creed proper. On the whole, it seems most reasonable to suppose, with Dr. Hort, that this "Epiphanian" creed was not formally authorised by the Council of Constantinople; but that it did probably receive a certain amount of countenance from the bishops there assembled, who would have a special motive for viewing it favourably, inasmuch as they were particularly desirous of vindicating the orthodoxy of Cyril of Jerusalem, whose native creed, as we have seen, was so largely represented by it.

The Council of Constantinople passed four canons. The first has been already described as a specimen of its doctrinal "Tome." The second was a development of Nicene legislation as to the territorial limitations of episcopal action. It presupposes, according to the general Eastern principle, the conformation of ecclesiastical boundaries to civil. The Roman world was divided into "dioceses" (of which there were six in the West, beside the Roman prefecture, and seven in the East), presided over by a "count," a prefect, or a vicar. A diocese was formed out of the aggregation of several provinces: thus one Eastern diocese contained eleven provinces, another nine, another five, and so on: and every province was ruled by a president, or proconsul, or consular, or "collector." For ecclesiastical purposes, the exarch or primate, not yet called technically "patriarch," was analogous to the count, prefect, or vicar; while the subordinate civil governor of a province had his ecclesiastical reflection, so to speak, in the metropolitan bishop. This being understood, we now observe that the Council in this second canon orders—

(1) That the bishops belonging to one "diocese" or group of provinces should not meddle with the affairs of churches beyond

its limit; agreeably to the fourteenth (so-called) Apostolic canon, which forbade any bishop to intrude himself into another's territory, and only permitted him to visit it at the entreaty of many bishops, and in order to give it the benefit of his teaching. This restriction, as Hefele says, would apply in the fullest sense to the chief bishop of the "diocese." Socrates adopts the words of the canon when he describes the Council as ordering that the bishops residing outside the limits of a "diocese" should not pass beyond their own limits into churches over the border.

(2) In particular, as to the several Eastern "dioceses," it is ordered (*a*) that the bishop of Alexandria should, according to the canons, administer the affairs of Egypt alone: this was a virtual repression of the interference of the see of Alexandria in the affairs of the Church of Constantinople in the case of Maximus. (*b*) That the bishops of the "Oriental" diocese (the eleven provinces of which looked to Antioch as their capital) should administer "Oriental" affairs only, saving the rights guaranteed at Nicæa to the see of Antioch—these rights or privileges being those of primacy and synodical presidency—whereas the bishop of Alexandria is here recognised as possessing larger powers throughout the Egyptian "diocese," he being virtually the only metropolitan, as well as the "archbishop," or chief prelate, of the Church in those countries. (*c*) Similarly, the bishops of the Asiatic "diocese" (which may generally be described as equivalent to Western Asia Minor) shall confine themselves to "Asia," and (*d*) those of the Pontic to Pontus, and (*e*) those of the Thracian to Thrace.

(3) Generally, again, it is ordered that no bishop shall go beyond his own "diocese" to perform episcopal acts, unless he be invited.

(4) Each provincial Church is to be administered by its provincial synod, according to the Nicene rules, so that the metropolitan's power is limited by canons; and the same holds good of the chief bishop of a "diocese."

(5) "The churches among the barbarians must be governed according to the custom received from the fathers," that is, must, so long as they are not strong enough to form independent churches, receive help and guidance from bishops within the Roman empire.

Such was the second canon of Constantinople. Socrates's account of it has raised some controversy. He says, "The bishops distributed the several provinces, and appointed patriarchs." It

has been thought that "patriarchs" here meant temporary commissioners, invested with high exceptional powers. This is Valesius's theory, advocated on the grounds that the patriarchal dignity was of much earlier origin, and had been "confirmed" by the sixth Nicene canon, and that Socrates goes on to speak of three bishops as obtaining "patriarchal" authority conjointly in the "Pontic" diocese, and two in the "Asian." But against this Beveridge contends that the Nicene canon had not dealt with "patriarchal" privileges at all, but with those of each province and metropolitical church; that the several bishops named by Socrates were not appointed by the Council itself, but were in fact those whom Theodosius, as we shall see, selected as centres of Catholic communion; and that, although the term "patriarch" was not technically in use at the time of the Council of Constantinople, it was this Council which actually constituted or organized the patriarchal system, inasmuch as it "made that distribution of the provinces on which the whole patriarchal system depended." But the probability is that Socrates is using "patriarchs" loosely for all the great metropolitans of the East.

The third canon of Constantinople was very brief, but very momentous. It ordered that the bishop of Constantinople should "hold the pre-eminence of honour after the bishop of Rome, because Constantinople was New Rome."

To explain this, we must observe that Byzantium had been greatly humbled as a city in the reign of the Emperor Severus, and, after a three years' siege had ended in its surrender, it was made subordinate to Heraclea Perinthus. And thus it came about that the bishop of Byzantium—when Byzantium became an episcopal see—was subject to the bishop of Heraclea, who in due time acquired the position of exarch or primate of the Thracian "diocese;" and when Byzantium became Constantinople, the same relation between the two sees was still maintained. Now, however, the Council assigned to the bishop of Constantinople a peculiar dignity, although it did not alter his position in regard to the authority of Heraclea, nor in regard to the rights of other churches. The canon ordered that the bishop of New Rome should enjoy an honorary pre-eminence next after the bishop of Old Rome—as to which, we must observe (1) that the Greek commentators, Balsamon and Zonaras, reject the gloss of some Greeks, to the effect that "after" denoted mere posteriority in order of time, and not any kind of superior dignity as belonging to the Church of the ancient capital; (2) that the pre-eminence universally recognised as belonging to

the Roman Church was derived mainly from the secular dignity of the Roman city, but also had some relation to its peculiar ecclesiastical and religious associations as connected with the apostolate of SS. Peter and Paul, an idea which had been enhanced by the erroneous supposition that St. Peter himself had been the first Roman bishop; (3) that this grant of pre-eminence in the second degree, to the Church of Constantinople, did not (*a*) abolish its dependence for certain purposes on the Church of Heraclea, nor (*b*) confer on it any "patriarchal" jurisdiction, such as it irregularly acquired under subsequent episcopates, and which was formally guaranteed to it by the Council of Chalcedon; but that (4) it certainly did involve a degradation, in regard to dignity, of the great sees of Alexandria and Antioch; and (5) it was for some time ignored by Alexandria, and persistently rejected by Rome.

The fourth canon of Constantinople was against Maximus, and has been already brought before us. The canons reckoned as fifth and sixth should be assigned to another Council, which, as we shall see, was held at Constantinople in 382; the so-called seventh canon, which is not in the collection of John of Antioch made in the sixth century, nor in any of the ancient versions, is, in fact, not a canon at all, but merely a statement of Church-practice in regard to the reception of heretics, and probably forms part of a letter written by a member of the Church of Constantinople in the middle of the fifth century to Martyrius, bishop of Antioch.

The Council, on concluding its labours, requested Theodosius to "set his seal" of approbation to what had been done. He complied by a law dated July 30, 381, addressed to Auxonius, proconsul of Asia. "We command all the churches to be delivered to those bishops who confess the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit to be of one majesty and power, of the same glory, of one brightness; making nothing discordant by a profane division, but observing the order of the Trinity, the distinction of the Persons, the unity of the Godhead. Those who shall be proved to be in communion with Nectarius bishop of Constantinople; in Egypt with Timothy bishop of Alexandria; in the East with Pelagius bishop of Laodicea, and Diodore of Tarsus; in Proconsular Asia and the Asian diocese with Amphilochius bishop of Iconium, and Optimus bishop of Antioch (*i.e.* in Pisidia); in the Pontic diocese with Helladius bishop of Cæsarea, and Otreius of Melitene, and Gregory of Nyssa; and in Thrace and Scythia with Terentius of Tomi and Martyrius of Marcianopolis,—will possess a right to be

allowed to occupy the Catholic Churches, on account of their fellowship and association with approved bishops. But all those who dissent from communion of faith with the bishops here expressly named, will have to be expelled, as manifest heretics, from the churches, nor will they, hereafter, be in any way capable of exercising the episcopal government in the churches; in order that the bishoprics may continue in the possession of those who hold in its purity the true and Nicene faith, and that after this plain declaration of our commands no place may be given to malignant subtlety."

So ended the Council which ranks as the Second of the Œcumenical Synods, but which certainly was not at the time, nor for a long time afterwards, regarded as Œcumenical. It acquired that dignity in virtue of the reception by the East of what was called its version of the creed, from the time of the Council of Chalcedon; but its legislation was not universally accepted even at that epoch, for the representatives of Rome protested when the Chalcedonian bishops renewed and developed the third canon of Constantinople. It was not until the sixth century that this synod was treated by the Roman Church as of anything like Œcumenical authority, and then only as to the condemnation of Macedonianism; while both then, and onwards into the beginning of the thirteenth century, until the great Lateran Council of 1215, the Popes disclaimed the obnoxious "third canon."

It is remarkable that while the Council of Constantinople was summoned as not properly General, but Eastern, another Council was gathered that same year in the West, which has never in any sense been regarded as General, but which was first asked for, like the Sardican, in the hope that it would be General, not simply Western. This was the famous Council of Aquileia. Palladius and Secundianus, two Illyrian bishops, had been accused of Arianism. They resented the charge, and as early as the beginning of 379 besought Gratian, who was then sole head of the empire, to have their case examined by a Council representing the whole Church. Gratian, it seems, acquiesced in their desire: he told Palladius—if the latter may be trusted—that he had bidden the Easterns to attend; but Ambrose, who about this time was composing, for Gratian's use, his work "On the Holy Spirit," persuaded him that an Italian Council would suffice for the purpose, and thus changed the plan which had been at first approved by the Emperor. We are also told that Ulfilas and other Arians requested Theodosius to summon a general synod, but that "the Athanasians" defeated

the project in that quarter also. Both Emperors were easily persuaded to deem it unadvisable. The Eastern bishops, having been summoned to Constantinople, did not think it necessary to attend a Western synod; for, it must be observed, difficulties intervened to delay the assembling of this synod until the same year as that in which the Council met at Constantinople. It was after midsummer in this year 381, that thirty-two Western bishops—some of them representing numbers of their absent colleagues—assembled at Aquileia, the great military and commercial city at the head of the Hadriatic, destined to be destroyed by Attila and his Huns in 452, but now the metropolis of Venetia and Histria, which together formed one of the seven provinces of the "Italic" diocese properly so called, under the jurisdiction of the "Vicar of Italy," the remaining Italian provinces being specially subject to the "Vicar of the City of Rome." Valerian, metropolitan of Aquileia, whose see, like that of Milan, was practically independent of Rome, was supported by Ambrose himself, by Anemius of Sirmium, Bassian of Lodi, Philastrius of Brescia, Eusebius of Bologna, Abundantius of Trent, and others, chiefly from the "Italian" Vicariate, or from Western Illyricum, there being also three Gallicans and two Africans, while Rome sent no deputies, nor did any one appear for the Church of Southern Italy, nor for that of Spain. Palladius and Secundianus were the only prelates connected with Arianism; but an Arian priest named Attalus appeared on their side, who had been more than once condemned for his adhesion to the heresy.

It was on Friday, September 3, according to the record of the Council which precedes the ninth epistle of St. Ambrose, that after several informal discussions had taken place, a regular sitting of the Council was held, in compliance with the request of Palladius; and Ambrose began by reminding him that Arius's letter to Alexander had been already read before the bishops, and proposing that he should, if he could conscientiously do so, condemn its propositions; or that, if he assented to them, he should argue in their defence. The Gospels were, as often, laid open before the assembly; and "the Apostle," *i.e.* the Epistles of St. Paul, and indeed the whole Scriptures, were at hand for reference. What would he say of the Arian statement, "the Father only is eternal"? After some objections taken by Palladius to the absence of Eastern bishops, which in his view was contrary to the understanding which had been presupposed, the Council anathematized all who did not own Jesus Christ to be "eternal;" the Gallican deputies expressly

attesting their Church's belief in this truth, and being followed by the representatives of the African and Illyrian Churches. The next point taken was, whether Palladius would own the Son to be "very God." Palladius at first tried to meet this by calling Him "very and Only-begotten Son." No, that was not sufficient, said the bishops: would he call Him "very Lord," and, according to the final passage in St. John's first Epistle, "very God"? One of the prelates said, "According to the faith of all, and the Catholic profession, Christ is very God: do you hold Him to be *not* very God?" Palladius, after an evasive admission of His "true Divinity" (for the word "divine" was then, as now, often used in a vague inadequate sense), ended by calling Him "the Power of our God." The Council declared Him to be "very Lord," and proceeded to ascertain whether Palladius held Him to have immortality according to His Divine Sonship; and the result was that the suspected bishop refused the test, and declined, moreover, to condemn Arius. There was some further discussion as to the wisdom, goodness, power, and judicial office of the Son, and then as to His co-equality. Palladius urged that the Father was "greater," and Ambrose explained, in the Latin manner, exhibited for us in the "Quicunque," that He was so "according to the flesh;" and the Council affirmed the Son to be co-equal to the Father according to His Divinity. Some more fencing followed on Palladius's part, although he had once risen, as if intending to leave the church: he would not say whether he admitted Christ's "subjection" to pertain to Him as to His manhood, or whether he would disown the statements that Christ "was a creature, that once He did not exist, that He did not always exist as the Only-begotten Son." Palladius persisted in declining to answer except in a "full Council:" sometimes, however, he dealt summarily with the doctrinal question by calling Ambrose impious or a transgressor, which, of course, amounted to an indirect rejection of orthodoxy. Again he demanded an adjournment until lay auditors of high rank could attend. When Valerian formally gave his opinion, to the effect that Palladius, in that he did not, and would not, condemn Arius, was himself an Arian, a blasphemer, and merited deposition, Palladius scornfully observed, "You have begun to play—play on! We shall not answer you without an Eastern Council." The bishops, one after another, gave their votes for his condemnation, and went on to deal with his companion Secundianus, who steadily refused to admit that Christ was "very God." It was not, he said, a phrase found in Scripture:

he would own Christ to be verily the Only-begotten Son, but nothing more. He also was deposed from the episcopate, and Attalus from the priesthood; and the Council thus finished a weary dispute which had begun at daybreak, and lasted until 1 p.m.

The next business was to draw up synodal letters. One, reckoned as the ninth in the Ambrosian series, was addressed to the bishops of three Gallic provinces, "Viennensis," and "Narbonensis prima" and "secunda," and contained a brief account of what had been done. Another letter was to the three Emperors, Gratian, Valentinian II., and Theodosius, in which it was observed that, owing to the freedom left by the terms of the imperial letters to attend or to stay away, no bishop had been constrained to attend the Council in spite of infirm health, old age, or distance of abode, probably with a covert reference to the inconveniences and hardships which had been felt, with such unhappy results, in the Ariminian Council; but, it was added, nearly all from all provinces of the West were present by their legates. The sovereigns were then informed of the line which had been taken in dealing with the two heretical bishops, who stood alone, or nearly alone, in the West—a hint that a General Council would have been needless for dealing with them—and who had "chosen to follow Arius rather than to confess the Son of God to be everlasting God." "We spent many hours in vain: their impiety did but grow, and could in no way be corrected." At last, proceeds the document (to summarise its statements), they interrupted the reading of Arius's letter, and asked us to reply to what they put forward, *i.e.* to their quotations from Scripture: they would not admit that Christ's inferiority to the Father must be referred to His humanity; they even referred the cause of His death to a certain inferiority of Divinity. For this latter imputation there was, apparently, no sufficient proof. The Council proceeded to describe the condemnation of the two bishops and the presbyter, and to denounce Valens, an Arian (not him of Mursa, but a younger man) who had been intruded into a Pannonian see, had betrayed the interests of the empire to the Goths, was reported to have put on a Gothic collar and armlet, and was now intriguing at Milan, and making up a party by means of ordinations. The letter concludes by asking that the law may be carried out against the Photinians, who were still attempting to hold meetings at Sirmium, which had for so many years been their fortress.

Another letter, addressed to all three Emperors, was specially meant for Gratian: it referred to the trouble still caused by Ursinus.

That persistent enemy of Damasus had now, during fifteen years, been avenging himself by a harassing policy for his defeat in the great contested election; released in 371 from his exile in Gaul, he had kept up his restless intrigues, and had even joined the Arians in disturbing the Church of Milan, and was still active in sending memorials through Paschasinus, an excommunicated person, renewing the old charges against Damasus; and these memorials had been formally made known to Gratian by the prefect of the city. The pagans were exultant, the faithful were in great anxiety, the whole Church might be involved in serious trouble: and the Council begged Gratian to secure the peace of the Roman Church, the centre of ecclesiastical communion, by finally discountenancing Ursinus.

In a fourth document (the twelfth Ambrosian letter) the Council thanked the Emperors for the restoration of Eastern Catholics to their Churches and the ejection of Arians (alluding to the law of January 10, 381), but asked them to consider the cases of Timothy and Paulinus—respectively, in the Council's view, the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch. Both, they say emphatically, have all along enjoyed their communion: a statement this, which shows decisively that these North-Italian bishops were not in communion with Meletius at the time of his death; and if they were not, Rome certainly was not either. The letter proceeds, in effect, "Some persons, whose orthodoxy was in former times doubtful, harass both prelates by opposition: we of the West would not be unwilling to extend our communion to these men if we could be assured of their soundness in the faith; but our first duty is to our own constant friends, the supporters of Paulinus. We received, some time ago, letters from both sides, and had thought of sending envoys to effect a reunion; but the times were not propitious, and we were only able to address you in support of the concordat made between the two parties as to the recognition by both of the surviving episcopal competitor." In these circumstances, the Council asks that a new General Council may be held in Alexandria. Two things are here obvious: the bishops would have spoken otherwise if Rome had entered into relations with Meletius, and they were unaware—strange as it may seem—of a Council having recently met at Constantinople. We also gather that they had become aware of the Antiochene compact made very early in 381, and had approved it. And perhaps Anglicans have not always recognised what was strong in Paulinus's case, and what was weak

in that of Meletius. It has been well said that "to acknowledge Paulinus was in effect to repudiate Meletius;" and this Rome had done.

The Council of Aquileia was speedily followed by a smaller council of "Italy," that is, of the bishops of the "Italic diocese" or Northern Italy, who would naturally meet at Milan. The date was early in 382, and Ambrose of course presided. The mind of the assembly is expressed in a letter to this effect. "Some time ago," they tell Theodosius, "we wrote to you in support of the Antiochene compact, which provided for the succession to that see. Now we learn that in a recent council of Easterns that compact has been set at nought—that a new bishop has been appointed to succeed Meletius, with the advice of Nectarius as bishop of Constantinople. But we demur to Nectarius's right to that position, and after Maximus had proved his own claim, to our satisfaction, in a synod, we wrote to you on the subject, having learned that Gregory was irregularly acting as bishop of Constantinople, and asked that the question should be deliberately and fully examined in a General Council." This must refer to the early part of 381, when such a council seems to have been in contemplation; but (the bishops proceed) the Easterns "declined such a meeting," *i.e.* preferred to meet by themselves; and how did they act? They knew that Maximus, following the precedent set by Athanasius, had come to urge his claims before us; but they chose at once to appoint Nectarius, whereas they should have waited to know the mind of the Westerns, who claim, indeed, no predominance in such a discussion, but a fair and equal share in a joint conclusion. "Here, then, we Westerns find ourselves precluded from communicating with the East; and the solution of the difficulty will be found in a General Council, which, we suggest, had better be held at Rome. Easterns, who thought it worth while to invite a single Western bishop (Ascholius) to their council at Constantinople, may fairly be asked to let this question be discussed with them by the Roman prelate and the bishops of districts near to Rome (*finitimi*) and of Northern Italy." There are some difficulties in this letter as to the time at which a General Council was proposed, and as to the time of that Italian synod which was misled by the false representations of Maximus, who, we learn, complained of being deserted (*i.e.* by Alexandria): Tillemont dates it after that of Aquileia, but it seems rather to have been held before the Council of Constantinople, soon after Maximus's repulse from

Alexandria, and, in fact, as Father Puller thinks, in the early summer of 381. But it is clear enough that the Milanese Council defines the claim which it makes for Westerns, and which it considers the Easterns to have ignored. The Easterns, it says, "should have waited for our opinion;" it would be absurd to construe this as meaning a decision from Rome—indeed, Rome had taken an opposite view of the case of Maximus; and in other passages of the letter what is demanded is not any overruling part for Rome or for the West in general, but only a fair share in the decision to be arrived at in a new Council. The Westerns were evidently aware that the Easterns (like the Eusebians in their correspondence with Julius) suspected them of unfair self-assertion; "what moves us," they say, "is no eagerness about ambitious projects of our own."

Gratian was, as we have seen, a facile prince; and he was particularly unlikely to neglect a request from Ambrose and his brethren. He issued letters inviting the Eastern bishops to attend a General Council to be held at Rome in the end of the current year, that is, of 382. But he was reckoning without his host; Theodosius did not approve of this Latin scheme. If there was to be a new Council, he naturally preferred to have it under his own eye in the New Rome. So it was that a number of bishops assembled there in the summer of 382, and their meeting might fairly enough be called a second session of the Council of 381.

Gregory was expressly invited: he had spent the latter half of 381 at his old home of Nazianzus, where he endeavoured in vain to settle and to fortify the Church-people against Apollinarianism. The prophet had but little honour in his own country. His motives were misunderstood, his manner was complained of, the presbyters as a body were unfriendly, and some of them put difficulties in the way, while the neighbouring bishops gave him no help; of one, especially, he complains in his poetic narrative of these troubles. He retired to his estate at Arianzus, where he passed the Lent of 382 in absolute silence, and wrote to Cledonius, "a zealously orthodox priest" of Nazianzus, his famous theological letter against Apollinarianism, insisting on the oneness of Christ's Person, speaking of Mary as "Theotocos," that is, as having given birth to Him as Man who was personally God, distinguishing between the Godhead and Manhood in Christ, and comparing them (as does the "Quicunque") to body and soul in man; but at the same time condemning any notion (such as was afterwards developed into

Nestorianism) which would level Christ to the position of a highly favoured prophet, or would not admit the Crucified One to be literally adorable, and any such speculation as that of Paul of Samosata to the effect that Christ was made Son of God after He became perfect in holiness, and also any denial of His permanent assumption of a real human body. In order to appreciate Gregory's earnestness against Apollinarianism, we must remember the active propaganda which Basil had described some five years before as having filled the world with the writings of Apollinaris, the "most copious writer in the world"—a phrase which apparently would include those of disciples as well as of their clever and versatile master. Some of them were even fraudulently assigned to great Catholic names with very mischievous effect. Missionaries, claiming the title of bishop, went about spreading his views as representing the only true and orthodox Christology. Thus, some three years later, we find Augustine's friend Alypius, at Milan, was for a while repelled from the Catholic faith by imagining it to be identical with Apollinarianism, which was to him unthinkable because the actions ascribed to Christ could not be performed without a soul at once "vital and rational." And the theory had far-reaching consequences: it ignored the office of Christ as Second Adam, in the work of our redemption; it left no room for any efficacious union between Christians and His life-giving Humanity; it obscured, or practically nullified, His Atonement and Mediation by regarding the Incarnation simply as a manifestation of the invisible Deity in a visible form; and we are assured by Basil that it connected itself with Sabellianizing language as to the Trinity, and, stranger still, with what looked like an intention of returning to Jewish ceremonial, and perhaps might be connected with Apollinarian inability to lay stress on Christ's death as a sacrifice. Thus the Apollinarian "novelties" might well be called, as Basil had called them, "omnigenous," and they were the more formidable for this variety of their attractions. How does Gregory in this letter deal with them? On the two great points of Apollinarianism, the denial of Christ's rational human soul, and the denial of His truly human body—in other words, the assertion that the Word was to Him in place of a mind, and the assertion that His body was derived from the Divine essence—Gregory enlarges with trenchant emphasis. "Anathema to him who says that His flesh descended from heaven, and had not the same human source as ours, though it be above us. . . . If any one puts his trust in a man who was without

a mind, *he* is indeed mindless, and deserves not to be saved in his own entirety. . . . If Adam fell only by halves, then (but only then) may what was assumed and saved be but a half." He next proceeds to compare the Apollinarian with the Arian view, which denied to Christ, as Man, an animal soul, "in order that the suffering might be ascribed to the Godhead," *i.e.* to the pre-existent nature which Arians laxly called divine. He rejects the Apollinarian suggestion, "His Godhead is a substitute for a mind;" he contends that if any part of our humanity was not assumed by the Saviour, it could not be saved—that as the whole of human nature fell, so the whole needs to be restored; he distinguishes between material and spiritual things, as to their power of combining "two things" in completeness; he observes that a human mind cannot be called "perfect" in comparison with the Godhead; he urges that the objection, "The mind was condemned (by the Fall)," would be still more fatal to Christ's assumption of a body, and that if the mind were not assumed, and thus healed, sins of the mind must lose their gravity. He notices the Apollinarian argument from "the Word became flesh," saying that "flesh" in that text stands for the whole man; he points (as Basil had done) to the strange Judaizing fantasies current in the sect, and to the speculations of Apollinaris, openly expressed in his writings, as to degrees of Godhead in the Trinity. Such was the substance of this letter, afterwards followed up by another on some Apollinarian glosses, which had attained considerable popularity.

It was when Gregory received the invitation to the Council of 382 that he wrote the famous letter, reckoned as his 130th, and repeatedly cited as against all ecclesiastical Synods. "If I am to tell the truth," he writes to Procopius the prefect, who had transmitted to him the summons, "I am disposed to avoid all assemblies of bishops. For I never saw any good end to a Council, nor any remedy of evils, but rather an addition of more evil, as its result. There are always contentions and strivings for dominion, beyond what words can describe. Therefore I have retired into myself, and deem quiet the only safety of the soul. Besides this, my resolution to this effect is confirmed by illness; I can hardly breathe, and I feel good for nothing. Persuade the most pious Emperor not to impute to me inertness, but rather to excuse my weakness, which, as he knows, was the reason for which, at my own earnest request, he permitted me to retire from Constantinople." The petition was not granted, for the excuse of illness, so freely

made in those days, was not taken as serious; a second and more urgent summons came, and Gregory had to write again to Olympius, "president" of the province of Cappadocia secunda, who was one of its bearers, and to Icarius, who was the other. The letter to Olympius is extant, and dwells briefly on his bad health and his entire unfitness to undertake a long journey and to plunge anew into "disturbances." Now, what importance is to be attached to Gregory's testimony as to the uselessness or even mischievousness of Councils? We may admit that the confusions of the Arian controversy, and the intense and passionate partisanship which it had called forth on both sides, had told unfavourably on the temper and character of many a Catholic prelate, and the unhappy strife in which the Church of Antioch had been involved had tended to increase the evil. Nor is it possible to ignore Gregory's repeated assertions, elsewhere made, as to the unworthy means by which several men rose to the episcopate, when imperial favour once more shone on the cause of Nicene orthodoxy. If we could deem him an unbiassed witness, his writings might furnish heavy indictment against the general run of his episcopal contemporaries. Some, he says, had come to the chief pastorship straight from secular callings, from the bar or the army, or even "from the plough or the smithy," and had by no means justified the experiment of such a sudden promotion. Some fawned on the great, paid court to the rich, preached smooth things to the people, professed to be "moderate men" when in fact they had no settled convictions, and he adds the scathing judgment that they might perhaps have improved, if it were not for their bishoprics; as it was, they verified the saying that power often makes men worse. He relieved his feelings by such denunciations; but we cannot take them, or other "jeremiads" of his, as dispassionate, and proceed broadly to condemn, on such evidence, the episcopate or the councils of the time. The letter is written under exhausting illness, by a worn-out and heart-wounded man advancing towards his sixtieth year; ten years before he has written, "To me inaction is the chiefest action;" he has all along been averse to publicity—a man of contemplation forced for a time into a life of action, but shrinking from the stress and effort, the endurances and the conflicts, which such a life involved; he has resigned his bishopric, has regained his beloved seclusion, and made up his mind to end his days in it: just then he is urged to return to public Church work, and that in co-operation with the very bishops whose jealousies and unkindnesses, in the Council of the

preceding year, had wounded him to the quick, and drawn forth from him as much bitterness as his gentle nature could express. We can hardly wonder that, at such a moment, he should write exaggeratedly or irritably; and to quote him unreservedly against Councils, when in this selfsame passage he is also declaring his intention to avoid all united action, and let Church business shift for itself, is to prove too much, and therefore to prove nothing.

The Council, then, when it reassembled at Constantinople in the summer of 382, had not the advantage, or the embarrassment, of Gregory's presence. It received a letter "from the bishops of the West," says Theodoret, inviting the presence of Eastern prelates at the General Council which was to be held at Rome. The Easterns, however, were in no mind to comply with such an invitation. They proceeded with their own business, ratifying the appointment of Flavian to the see of Antioch, condemning Apollinarianism, and equally condemning the Sabellian and Eunomian errors. They drew up a letter to the bishops who were to meet at Rome, especially mentioning Damasus, Ambrose, Valerian, Ascholius, and others. After dilating on the miseries of the Arian persecution, not without an allusion to the want of sympathy which had been shown by the Westerns under an infliction from which the East could only hope gradually to recover, the bishops advert to the trouble still caused by "wolves who, even after being driven out of the fold, are seizing on the sheep in the forest." There is much for the Eastern Church to do. Her bishops would gladly have complied with the invitation to the Roman Council as given by the Western Emperor, but they cannot go so far away from their own flocks at so critical a time. They have assembled at Constantinople in consequence of the letter addressed in the preceding year by the Council of Aquileia to Theodosius. This statement was hardly ingenuous, for the Aquileian letter had asked for a Council at Alexandria; but the bishops explained themselves to mean that they could not do more, in the way of complying with the Aquileian request, than they had done by coming to Constantinople. It is probable enough that when they came thither they had not—or, at least, most of them had not—been informed of the request of the Council of Milan, only a few months earlier, for a new Council to be held at Rome. This, in fact, is what they plead; they urge that they had no commission from their brethren in regard to any such Council, and that they could now do no more

than send this synodal letter by the hands of three bishops, Cyriacus, Eusebius, and Priscian, who could make known to the Westerns their desire of unity, and their zeal for that true Nicene faith, which, as "based on the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, is a belief in the one Deity, power, and essence, the equal dignity, the co-eternal kingdom, of the three all-perfect hypostases or prosopa of a Trinity uncreate, co-essential, co-eternal." Then follows a reprobation of Sabellianism, as confusing the "hypostases" and destroying their "proper" characteristics; and of all schools of Arians as dividing the essence, and introducing into the Trinity a created nature, different in essence and subsequent in origin. But this is not all; the Council takes care to guarantee its orthodoxy on the Christological side also; the Word, it says, perfectly assumed a perfect humanity consisting of body, soul, and mind, but continued to be One, who, having been perfect Word of God before all ages, became in the last days perfect Man; language akin at once to the "Quicunque" and to the "Definitio Fidei" of Chalcedon. The bishops then refer to what they call "the Tome of the synod of Antioch," which is supposed to be a compilation from several Roman synods, accepted by the Council held at Antioch under Meletius in September of 379—and explicit enough on the Trinity and the Incarnation—and to the "Tome" of the recent synod of Constantinople, which they venture to call Œcumenical. They hope that the Westerns will rejoice with them in what they have decided as being lawful and canonical; they vindicate the appointments of Nectarius and Flavian by what they describe as the Nicene rule that bishops should be consecrated by their comprovincials with the co-operation, if necessary, of neighbouring bishops—a polite way of intimating that Westerns had nothing to do with these two appointments, which however, at any rate as regarded Flavian, was rather technically than morally correct, for the Antiochene dissension had been matter of serious interest to all Christendom. We must add that the clause about neighbouring bishops is not in the fourth Nicene canon, but something like it is in the Greek form of the sixth Sardican—which looks as if the Sardican canons had come (not without confusion) to the knowledge of the Eastern bishops. To proceed; they mention Cyril as rightful bishop of the mother-church of Jerusalem, and eulogize his various endurances in the contest with Arianism. And they conclude with an emphatic plea for Christian unanimity, as to be attained by the Western recognition of these Eastern prelates; so that, East and

West being united in faith and love, there may be no more of partisanship for Paul, Apollos, or Cephas, and all may be seen to belong to the one undivided Christ. "Nothing," says Tillemont in his quietly caustic style, "can be more courteous and more Christian than this letter, *provided that it is sincere*." It shows a touch of Greek cleverness and special pleading; and perhaps a Latin mind would not be quite well pleased on reading it through.

To this Council, or this meeting of the Council, belong really the so-called fifth and sixth canons of the Council of 381. The "fifth" is somewhat provokingly curt. "Concerning the Tome of the Westerns, we recognise those at Antioch who confess one Godhead of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit." Here is another "Tome" at first sight; but probably the Council means what it has already called the Tome of the Synod of Antioch. The "sixth" canon deals with the subject of accusations brought against orthodox bishops. Any charges not affecting religion—*i.e.* charges referring to personal conduct—must be admitted without asking questions as to the character or religious belief of the accuser. But heretics and schismatics must not be allowed to accuse bishops on religious grounds; nor must persons excommunicate, until they are themselves clear of guilt; and similarly, no person already under accusation must accuse a bishop or cleric, until the charge against himself is disproved. Competent accusers of bishops for ecclesiastical offences must bring their cases before the bishops of the province, and may then appeal to those of the whole "diocese" or group of provinces; and any accuser who, despising this latter tribunal, "should trouble the Emperor's ears, or the courts of secular magistrates, or an Œcumenical Council, is not even to be allowed a hearing, as having insulted the canons, and violated the good order of the Church."

We must now follow the three delegates of Constantinople on their westward journey. It is possible, as Tillemont suggests, that they brought with them, besides the synodical letter, the letter (not extant) from Theodosius to the bishops of Northern Italy, stating the facts as to Maximus, and explaining the reasons for not holding one general synod for the settlement of Eastern affairs; reasons in which, as it appears from the 14th Ambrosian letter, which was the answer of the North-Italian prelates to these explanations, the latter felt it necessary to acquiesce, while in doing so they repelled with some dignity the Easterns' charge of partisan feeling. At Rome the Council met in the latter part of the year 382; it was

attended by Ambrose, by Anemius of Sirmium, by Ascholius of Thessalonica, who, on arriving, found Ambrose ill, and went at once to visit him; and who, although his country was now part of the Eastern Empire, had been, as we have seen, entrusted by Damasus with what may be called a Vicarial authority over the churches of the so-called Macedonian and Dacian dioceses, including Achaia, Crete, and Epirus, by way of retaining them under the control of the Pope. But there were also at this Council some eminent representatives of the East. Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis, came to Rome in company with Paulinus, who, of course, would be received with all honour as the legitimate and ever-faithful bishop of Antioch. He had now been a bishop twenty years, Epiphanius about fifteen. They were accompanied by a visitor who was destined to make his mark alike in Eastern and Western Church history. Hieronymus, or Jerome, born in Pannonia in 346, the year of Athanasius's second return, had already seen much of the world; he had studied rhetoric and been baptized at Rome, had sojourned in Gaul, and studied theology amid a circle of friends at Aquileia, had visited Antioch, had retired into the Syrian "desert," and had there written to Damasus a letter of enthusiastic deference, for instruction as to the Communion which in Antioch might represent the Church, and had professed to "abhor Meletius" and to "ignore Paulinus;" but two years later he thought better of the latter declaration, and in 378 had received from Paulinus ordination to the priesthood. Since that time he had visited Constantinople, and studied under Gregory Nazianzen, whom he calls "his preceptor, by whose aid as a commentator he studied the Scriptures," and in whose company he heard Gregory of Nyssa read his own work against Eunomius.

Epiphanius was lodged in the house of Paula, who was to become so famous among the Christian women of that century; she had lost her husband two years before, and although the shock of grief had well-nigh proved fatal, she had speedily "turned herself" most thoroughly "to the Lord's service." Paulinus was received into another house, where Paula could still enjoy his society; and the conversation of the two bishops had a great effect in bending her mind towards monastic seclusion. Their presence in the Council was of course a most interesting event; Flavian's appointment was treated as null, and he himself as out of communion with the West, together with Diodore of Tarsus and Acacius of Berœa, who had been his consecrators; but it does not appear that anything was

said or done against Nectarius, and the facts of the case as to Maximus were doubtless by this time made known to Ambrose. The Apollinarian question had already been formally handled by a Roman synod, or rather by more than one; but, by one account, the Pope on this occasion drew up a formulary which might serve as a test, employing for this purpose a learned priest, who was, in fact, Jerome. In this formulary, the term "Man of the Lord" was used, as applicable, on high authority, to Christ; but an Apollinarian, on being shown it as occurring in St. Athanasius, attempted by a mean trick to represent it as a spurious addition, and it became evident that the phrase might suggest a heterodox idea. The two Eastern bishops spent the winter in Italy, and returned home in the spring of 383. But the presbyter, who was greater than either prelate, was retained in Rome by Damasus to act as his secretary. He found for himself also a distinct and attractive sphere of interest as the adviser and instructor of a clique of aristocratic ladies, whose centre of devotion and study was the ample mansion on the Aventine inherited and occupied by Marcella. In this congenial atmosphere Jerome spent a few quiet years. The details of his occupations may be considered hereafter: at present it suffices to say that while Christendom in some important respects owes him an immense debt of gratitude, modern Christians will find it hard to love him, hard even to bear with what Dean Church calls his "ruggedness, irritability, and coarseness, his utter want of taste or justice or moderation"—hard, perhaps, to understand how a man could be so self-denying and earnest, and yet so passionate and so little softened by his religion. He is a study in contrasts in the anomalies of the human temperament; but if it costs us an effort to appreciate his goodness, let us remember how his heart went forth to those good women at Rome for whose rank and riches he cared simply nothing.

The Council of the Eastern bishops was again summoned to meet in the June of 383. Theodosius clung to the hope that, by further discussion in such an assembly, the dissident sects might be reconciled to the Church, and the disturbances which their hostility excited might be brought to an end. He had declined, says Theodoret, to follow the suggestion of Amphilochius, the bishop of Iconium, and prohibit the Arians from holding any meetings within the cities: he thought such a measure "oversevere," although one of his edicts had embodied it. Much might be done, he conceived, by fair reasoning. He began by desiring

Nectarius to confer with him: "We must have a full debate on all the doctrinal questions at issue." The bishop, in his natural anxiety, consulted, on his return from the palace, with Agelius, the ascetic Novatianist bishop, who still lived amid the veneration of his followers, and who had been, for a short time, a confessor under Valens. He had as little skill in controversy as Nectarius, and at once fell back on his Reader Sisinnius, a man of some mark, who, though not distinguished for any austerities, was a controversialist formidable even to Eunomius, familiar with secular as well as with sacred learning, and singularly apt at lively repartee, some instances of which are complacently given by Socrates. This adviser showed his ability by a proposal which, as he considered, would bring matters to an issue, and avoid interminable debates. "Let the Emperor," he said, "ask the heterodox leaders this plain question: 'Will you accept the authority of those Christian teachers who lived before the Arian controversy?' They must in that case either accept those fathers as witnesses of Christian truth, or disown them; and if they disown them, they must be consistent and condemn them. If they condemn them, their own followers will instantly cast them off; and if they accept them, we can produce the books of those fathers as evidence of their belief in a divine and co-eternal Son. For none of those early writers ever laid down that proposition which is the basis of Arianism, 'Once the Son did not exist.'" The bishop of Constantinople hurried back to the palace, fortified by this ingenious suggestion, which would commend itself to his mind as accordant with the claim of Catholicity to be the historical, traditional, primeval belief. Theodosius, we are told, at once appreciated the proposal, and acted upon it. He asked the several representatives of heterodox sects, who had been assembled in Constantinople with a view to the proposed discussion, whether they would stand by the theology of the ancient divines? "Yes," was the answer, "we revere them as true teachers." "Will you, then, take them as competent witnesses of the true sense of Scripture?" This question produced a Babel of discordant utterances: for some professed their readiness to appeal to antiquity, others—even among representatives of the same school or community—declined the test, conscious that antiquity was against them. Theodosius, not without some words of reproach, adopted another plan, and ordered each of the contending parties, orthodox or heterodox, to draw up a written statement of belief and present it to him on a certain day.

Nectarius and Agelius acted together in framing, or, most probably, employing their theologians to frame, a doctrinal formulary. Demophilus, the moderate Arian bishop, who, some three years before, had refused to adopt the Nicene faith at Theodosius's exhortation, and had transferred his congregation to a place outside the walls, appeared with a paper which probably embodied the Homoion. There too was seen Eleusius of Cyzicus, who had stood up so firmly at the Council of Seleucia for the "faith of the fathers," meaning the Creed of the Dedication Synod; who had been deposed by Acacians at Constantinople; had been expelled by Julian for having destroyed some temples and converted many pagans; had yielded, under terror of Valens, to the dominant Arianism; had bitterly repented in presence of his flock, and vainly endeavoured to resign his see; and now, in old age, after having once before resisted the persuasions of Theodosius and his bishops, came forward as a specimen of those Semi-Arians who, declining to adopt the Nicene Creed, had identified themselves with Macedonianism. One other figure of importance was seen among the group—a dignified and graceful one, as Philostorgius tells us from his own recollections, although the face was marked by the "white leprosy," and the voice, so often triumphantly persuasive, so skilful in all emergencies, could never get rid of a lisp, which his admirers professed to think attractive: such, in outward fashion, was the great Anomœan controversialist, Eunomius, as he stood face to face with enemies who must have looked upon him with mingled fear and abhorrence, as a special instrument of "seducing spirits," as the great destructive rationalist of his time. Eleusius, whom he had superseded at Cyzicus, would doubtless frown or shudder at his presence; and Demophilus would see in him the representative of that intense and thorough-going Arianism which kept no terms with the less pronounced forms of non-Catholic theology, and which even rebaptized converts who abandoned the Homoion for the Anomoion. Eunomius had many strange vicissitudes to remember: his early life at his father's farm in Cappadocia, his employment as shorthand writer to Aetius, his sojourn with him in Alexandria, his ordination as deacon at Antioch, his temporary concealment of his opinions as bishop of Cyzicus, his unwariness when craftily approached by anti-Arians who conspired to entrap him, his quarrel with Eudoxius in behalf of Aetius, his controversy with Basil, his quiet life on his estate at Chalcedon, "close to the sea-wall," his narrow escape, by aid of

Valens of Mursa, from African exile: what might now be reserved for him, when, after having been prevented from seeing the Emperor Valens, and again, by the devout Empress Flacilla, from having an interview with Theodosius, he was summoned to the imperial presence as one of the great rival theologians of the time? He had followers, as he knew, throughout Asia Minor, "from Mount Taurus to the Hellespont:" his voluminous writings were widely dispersed, he had won many minds over by his fluent logic, and by his wholesale denial of all mysteriousness in religion: might he hope at last for a more brilliant victory? He gave in his paper, his "Exposition;" which, alone of the papers presented on that memorable occasion, is still extant. It begins by assigning to Christ the name of God and Saviour, while quoting His command to confess Him before men; it then affirms One only God, the Father, personally alone in Deity, with no sharer in His glory or His Kingship; it proceeds to speak of the Son as true and "Only-begotten God," but as not uncreate, and not associated in the Father's glory; it acknowledges Him to be like the Father as a son is like a father, as the image of the Father's action, the seal of His words and counsels. It sets forth the proper Arian conception of the Holy Spirit as made by, and inferior to the Son, as the highest of all His works. The formula asserts, in most absolute terms, a resurrection of bodies, a judgment extending to the slightest acts, words, thoughts, feelings of this life, an endless punishment of those who are "finally wicked;" and concludes by disclaimer of all "unhallowed" opinions such as calumny imputed to the writer. It must be admitted that Eunomius, although he repeatedly ascribed "divinity" to the Son, was most explicit in regard to the sense in which he did so: no one could possibly gather from his statement that he believed the Son to be included within the divine essence; there was rather an elaborate and, in the circumstances, a manly and outspoken distinctness of expression as to the pure and simple "Unitarianism" intended to be set forth. How were all these papers treated?

We are told by Socrates—but this detail in his story is at least suspicious, and may indeed be set aside as inconsistent with Theodosius's character—that the Emperor shut himself up alone and prayed for Divine guidance. Of this Sozomen tells us nothing, but merely says that Theodosius pronounced in favour of the statement which embodied Nicene orthodoxy. The opponents of that faith were thrown into despondency, and had the mortification

of seeing some of their adherents embrace the Homoousion. Theodosius, according to a famous story, was impressed, about this time, by the significant familiarity, or want of due observance, with which Amphilochius treated his little son Arcadius, who in the January of this year had been nominally associated with him in the empire. "If you, O Emperor, cannot brook my want of respect to your son, what, think you, will God do to those who insult His?" The inference intended, and understood, was that the sovereign power should be employed more stringently against Arians. This was done. Eunomius was banished into Mœsia: some of the court chamberlains, who had imbibed his opinions, were expelled from the palace; and Theodosius promulgated, on July 25, 383, a new law against heretics—Eunomians, Arians, and Macedonians being named first, and then Manicheans, and Encratites, and others, whose names give proof of the popularity of various forms of fanatical asceticism. All these persons are forbidden to "collect any crowds, draw any people after them, or use private houses for their religious meetings, or do anything in public or private which may give offence to Catholic sanctity." If any of them break this law, they may be expelled from cities by the co-operation of those who "take pleasure in the beauty of the true religion." Another law followed this on September 3, amplifying the former prohibitions, and adding the Apollinarians to the list of heretics: all gatherings for heretical worship are forbidden in the most absolute and emphatic terms; in town and in country alike, heretics are not to assemble, nor "perform the solemnities of their unholy fellowship," nor to ordain bishops; any houses in which they have held meetings are to be confiscated, and their clergy are to be sent back to their native districts, and there detained.

So vain were the Emperor's hopes of a peaceful settlement of controversies; and so easily was he swayed into the adoption of a severely repressive policy in the supposed interests of the Church —although, in Sozomen's opinion, his laws against heretics were intended rather to intimidate than to oppress, and were sometimes allowed to remain "bruta fulmina." Allowance must be made for a monarch inheriting the traditions of the heathen empire as to the treasonable character of overt religious dissidence; it was only too natural to carry them over into the area of his Christian sovereignty, without asking whether they would harmonize with the Christian spirit—to assume, in fact, that they provided him

with an expression of Christian duty—only too natural indeed, when ecclesiastics urged it on him. And while the vexatious question of "nonconformity" was thus exercising his patience, he learned in another direction the obstinate vitality of feuds within the Church. The Antiochene difficulty, which had been perpetuated by the self-willed partisanship of the majority at the first Council of Constantinople, was a legacy of disturbance bequeathed by it to the third. Two years after the death of Meletius, and the unhappy resolution to appoint a new bishop, and not Paulinus, as his successor, we learn from Socrates that the bishops at the Council of 383 were divided about the claims of Flavian and of Paulinus. If the former was supported by Syria, Phœnicia, Palestine, and clearly Asia Minor also, the latter, lately strengthened by the decided expression of Western sympathy in the Roman Council, was the true bishop of Antioch in the eyes of the Egyptian, Arabian, and Cypriot bishops, who loudly demanded that Flavian should be expelled from Antioch—a demand impossible to be granted, but ominous of protracted strife, and of further distress, as Socrates phrases it, to those who held the faith of the Homoousion.

Such were the signs of the times in the Eastern Church, when the summer of 383 was passing away. And at that very moment a tragedy was working itself out in the West, which was probably not known to Theodosius and his subjects, until it attained its consummation, but which to men like Ambrose in Italy was matter of profound and poignant regret. The Emperor Gratian, by his frivolity and want of thought, had alienated the Western legions; the troops in Britain prevailed on Clemens Maximus, "the countryman and fellow-soldier of Theodosius," who in the preceding year had repelled the inroads of the Picts and the Scots, to "accept the dangerous present of the imperial purple." Gratian was at Paris when Maximus invaded Gaul. It seems that as soon as he heard of the rebellion, his Christian sensitiveness of conscience, stimulated by fear, led him to renounce the heathen title of Pontifex Maximus, which he had hitherto retained after confiscating, or otherwise appropriating to better uses, the revenues of the pagan temples of Rome, removing the altar of Victory from the Senate-house, and dismissing, unheard, the senators who came to ask for its restoration. He fled to Lyons, and was there detained by the treacherous governor of the province, until the arrival of a cavalry officer of Maximus, who put him to death by a base

stratagem on August 25, 383. Jerome, thirteen years later, apostrophizes Lyons, "Thy palace walls bear traces of a bloody hand." It was a sad end, and a premature one, of the life that had begun so hopefully. Gratian was faulty and weak, but the Western Church had cause to love him well: the innocent, pure-hearted prince who had asked Ambrose to write a manual of doctrine for his benefit—who, after sequestrating a basilica, had voluntarily restored it to the Church—who in his last hours of supreme peril had longed for Ambrose as a deliverer, and called upon his name with piteous earnestness—might well be mourned by him, even when nine years had elapsed since that terrible night at Lyons, in the tender words which recall the lamentation over Jonathan: "Doleo in te, fili Gratiane, suavis mihi valde."

CHAPTER XXIII.

THE WEST IN THE LAST YEARS OF DAMASUS.

THE sudden success of Maximus and the tragical death of Gratian must have filled the minds of Western churchmen, in the early autumn of 383, with consternation and anxiety. Justina trembled, as well she might, for the safety of her boy, on whom had thus descended the undivided burden of legitimate sovereignty at a moment which seemed fraught with peril to the whole imperial house. Valentinian II. was twelve years old when he lost his elder brother. The Empress-mother—who had formerly prejudiced Valentinian I. against Martin, had set herself to thwart Ambrose, when about three years previously he resolved on securing a Catholic bishop for the see of Sirmium, and after failing in this attempt had laid "numberless plots" against him—felt that, in this crisis, all dislike for the archbishop of Milan must yield to the imperious necessity of procuring his support for her son's cause. She led the young Emperor into his presence, and presented him to be embraced by Ambrose, who, writing eleven years later, thus apostrophizes Valentinian: "I clasped thee in my arms, when thy mother Justina's hands presented thee to me." At Justina's request, he undertook a journey to Treves, in order to negotiate something like a treaty between the victorious usurper of the Northern sovereignty and the endangered Italian court. The winter was coming on, but he did not hesitate; he repaired to the headquarters of Maximus, and was there detained until early in 384, in order that Maximus might learn, before dismissing him, what terms had been made by Count Victor, whom he had sent to Milan before the arrival of Ambrose and who met Ambrose near Mentz. Those terms were not all that Maximus had expected; the young Emperor would not, said Victor, come to visit Maximus, but would make peace with him on condition of being left

undisturbed in the dominion of Italy, Africa, and Western Illyricum, while Maximus should be acknowledged as sovereign of Gaul, Spain, and Britain. Thus the court of Milan was saved; the firm tone taken by Ambrose contributed, doubtless, to this result, by inducing Maximus to accept a compromise which kept him out of Italy; and he would be impressed by the austere refusal of the bishop of Milan to communicate with him in those days of his early triumph. In him Ambrose could not but see the virtual destroyer of Gratian; and it must have cost Theodosius much to treat with Maximus on terms which recognised his Transalpine sovereignty.

The usurper thus legitimatised in the eyes of all subjects of the empire found himself called upon, very early in his reign, to take cognisance of the Priscillianist controversy. We may remember that Gratian had been induced by his home minister Macedonius to rescind his edict against Priscillian and Instantius, and to permit their return to Spain. "They then," says Sulpicius, "without any contest resumed possession of their churches." And they procured the powerful support of the proconsul Volventius; in reliance on which, they thought it a good opportunity for avenging themselves on Ithacius, and accused him of "disturbing the churches:" he was actually condemned to death, but contrived to escape to Gaul, and invoked the aid of the prætorian prefect Gregory, who thereupon ordered the arrest of Priscillian and laid the case before Gratian. But Macedonius, it is said, received a large sum of money from Priscillian and his friends, and in consideration of it obtained an imperial order, removing the judicial cognisance of the business from the prefect, and placing it in the hands of the vice-prefect, or "vicar," who had lately superseded the proconsul in Spain. This magistrate's name was Marinianus. Further, Macedonius sent officials to arrest Ithacius, who was then staying at Treves. But the bishop, although, in Sulpicius's opinion, a shallow, foolish, and inconsistent person, succeeded in baffling this attempt, and afterwards found a protector in Brito or Britannius, who then held the see of Treves, and had sat in the Roman Council of the preceding year 382. While he was in this critical position, the capital of the Gallic prefecture was startled by the tidings of the revolt of Maximus. He had been declared Emperor in Britain; he would come over speedily into Gaul; it was evident that Gratian's troops would desert him; there was a near prospect of a new reign, and Maximus might choose to reverse

the ecclesiastical policy of Gratian. As soon, then, as Maximus established himself in Treves, Ithacius came boldly forward, and urgently petitioned him against the Priscillianists. The new Emperor listened, and at once gave orders to the prefect of Gaul and to the "vicar" of Spain to send all who were "tainted" with Priscillianism for trial before a Council at Bordeaux.

This Council met accordingly, in 384 or 385. Instantius was tried first. We can easily imagine the accusations which would be poured forth against the new heretics. "They are unfit to be treated as Christians, not to say as bishops. They do indeed speak of the Trinity, but it is in the sense of Sabellianism; of Christ, but theirs is the Christ of Photinus, who is said to have had no existence before He was born of the Virgin—nay, rather, altogether a Docetic Christ, for they do not believe in the reality of His bodily existence, and *that* explains their obstinate fasting on the anniversary of the Lord's birth and on the weekly commemoration of His resurrection. Penetrate further into their odious mysteries, and you find that they derive the soul of man from the very essence of God; they have adopted from Manicheans the dream of an evil principle arising out of darkness, and of emanations from the kingdom of light, which, being in fact so many souls, have vowed in God's presence to combat the dark powers, and descending to earth have been enclosed by those powers in bodies, the several parts of which are under the control of the signs of the zodiac, or 'stars of destiny.' It is for the deliverance of these souls that the Christ is imagined to have come; they will, according to the sect, be delivered in the end, by His help, from all dark influences: *this* is the Priscillianist salvation! These men will tell us that they believe all the Canonical Scriptures. Yes, but they explain them away by perverse allegorizings; and they rely also on some contemptible apocrypha, which seem to be of Manichean origin. They may put on the semblance of grave austerity; but their hostility to marriage goes the whole length of trying to separate what God has joined, and there are suspicions, or more than suspicions, of impure practices among them—there was, in this very region of Aquitania, a scandal against Priscillian's conduct when he passed through it on his way to Rome. They add magic to their other offences; and then, to sum up, you cannot trust their disclaimers; they will abjure anything, dissemble anything; their principle is contained in one vile verse—

'Jura, perjura; secretum prodere noli!'

Let the Council do justice to the Church, and confirm the judgment of the Council of Saragossa: these men are not ordinary heretics, they are positively antichristian, and pestilent to morality and public order; and Bishop Delphinus, by his conduct in repelling them from this city three years back, has shown his sense of their guilt and set this synod a good example." Such would be something like the charge. The imputation of magic was idle, and that of dissolute conduct, as Neander says, is, "to say the least, not sufficiently authenticated;" but the rest of the allegations were true, and Instantius made but a poor defence, which was followed by sentence of his deposition from the episcopate. Priscillian would not plead at all: "to avoid being heard by the bishops, he appealed"—using doubtless the old technical word "provoco"—to the Emperor. The Council allowed his appeal: Sulpicius severely blames their weakness, and says that they should "either have proceeded to pass sentence, or, if they suspected, *i.e.* mistrusted, themselves, should have reserved the hearing for other bishops, and not permitted guilt so manifest to be brought by appeal before the Emperor." The opinion of the historian is in conformity with the twelfth canon of the Dedication Council of 341, which, says Bingham, was "conformable to the received discipline of the ancient Church." Priscillian was following the precedent of those African schismatics who had appealed from the Council of Arles to Constantine—an appeal which Constantine himself called shameless, although it related to facts, which, it would be said, had been wrongly represented, and although, to leave them without excuse, he consented to hear the cause. The appeal of Athanasius from the Council of Tyre to Constantine presupposed the gross and patent injustice which had deprived that assembly of all its moral weight, and also referred to the fact that the so-called Council at Tyre had been from the outset not purely an ecclesiastical synod, having been presided over by a Count under orders from the Emperor. Probably the Spanish bishop would say, in *his* appeal, that he could expect no justice at Bordeaux.

Thus the Priscillianists were brought—fatally for themselves—to Treves; and Ithacius and Idacius followed them. It is at this point of the story that Sulpicius gives signal proof of his honesty and fair-mindedness: "To state my own opinion, I like the accusers as little as the accused. Certainly I am positive that Ithacius had nothing like a real interest in the matter, no real conscientiousness;" and then, after sketching his character as

talkative, audacious, impudent, fond of expense, excessively self-indulgent, he tells us that this inquisitor into heretical pravity was so foolish and headlong in his judgments of character as to set down all studious or strict-living persons, or all who were diligent in fasting, as so many Priscillianists. The "audacity" of Ithacius in this direction was exhibited against Sulpicius's special hero; and it is not without the deepest interest that we can read of the relations between the prosecutors in this great appeal-case and St. Martin.

He had occasion to visit Treves, in order to solicit the clemency of Maximus for some persons who, apparently, had incurred peril by the revolution, as being adherents of Gratian. But, in contrast with the servility of some bishops who came to present like requests, the bishop of Tours spoke as "commanding rather than petitioning." This demeanour, which Tillemont calls "holy pride," was impressive; and Maximus frequently invited Martin to his table. He declined, out of respect for Gratian's memory; he could not sit at the table of one who had caused his prince's death. Maximus condescended to explain. The sovereignty had been forced on him: God appeared to have declared on his behalf by an unexpected victory; and none of his adversaries had been slain, by his command, save in open fight. At last the bishop departed from the rigorous position which he had at first taken up as to Maximus's conduct, and consented to come to the imperial table: he was seated on a small chair, close to Maximus, while his attendant presbyter was ranked with the prefect Evodius, and with two powerful "counts," the Emperor's brother and uncle. Halfway through the feast, a bowl of wine was, as usual, handed to Maximus; he ordered it to be passed on first to Martin, expecting, says Sulpicius, that it would be returned to him by the bishop with his own hand. But Martin, after drinking, quietly and as a matter of course passed it to "his presbyter," as being of higher dignity than any secular prince. Maximus, who had a good deal of religious sentiment, was not only astonished, but pleased, or, at any rate, thought fit to appear pleased, at this extremely downright expression of the ecclesiastical conception of society, even in the presence of the power of this world: an expression which no other bishop had ventured on even at the tables of ordinary judges. He often sent for Martin in order to hear him talk; and the Saint spoke of nothing but religion, duty, heavenly blessedness, while the Empress hung on his words, and at last insisted on waiting on

him at a meal, arranging the chair and table, bringing water for his hands, setting on food which she herself had cooked, standing beside him in motionless observance, mingling and presenting his drink, and collecting the very fragments of bread from his plate at the conclusion of the supper, as if such relics were preferable to an imperial banquet. It was clear, then, to all at Treves that Martin was, by the pure force of his majestic character, a power in the court. What view would he take of the Priscillianist case? The answer was soon given. He could not but regard such a champion of orthodoxy as Ithacius with indignation, even with disgust. "His strong spiritual instinct," it has been said, "led him at once to take a definite line in favour of moderation." He rebuked the accuser for his merciless zeal; and Ithacius repaid the interference by publicly branding the bishop of Tours as infected with the heresy. Martin betook himself to Maximus, and begged him "not to shed the blood of those unhappy men. It is more than enough that they have been expelled from their churches, as heretics, by a sentence of bishops. It would be a new and unheard of scandal that a secular judge should decide a Church cause." Thus he procured an adjournment of the case; and when he had to leave Treves, he obtained a promise from Maximus that the accused should not be put to death. The promise was soon represented, by very different advisers, as not binding. "Matters," says Newman, "went on as if Martin had never been at Treves." Two bishops, Magnus and Rufus, persuaded the Emperor to commit the case, at once, to the hearing of the upright but rigorous prætorian prefect Evodius. Priscillian was examined, and it was doubtless under torture that confessions of magical practices, and of gross impurities, were wrung from the heresiarch, as from Knights Templar under Philip the Fair. Evodius pronounced him guilty, and remanded him until the Emperor's "pleasure should be known." The report of the trial was carried to the palace, and Maximus made up his mind that Priscillian ought to die, as a sorcerer and a corrupter of morals: but he resolved to hold a final inquiry, from which Ithacius, now that his wicked scheme had proved successful, thought it prudent to absent himself; and Patricius, a "solicitor" for the imperial treasury, was appointed accuser on this occasion. Priscillian, who had himself averred that "magicians ought to be cut off by the sword," was condemned and beheaded at Treves, and with him suffered two clerics who had recently gone over to his side, an accomplished layman, and a lady named Euchrocia, who

had been Priscillian's hostess during his former stay in Gaul, and whose daughter he was accused of having led astray. Instantius was more gently dealt with, being banished, with another adherent named Tiberianus, to the Scilly Islands. Further legal processes produced various punishments: a tumultuary outbreak of fury, at Bordeaux, ended in the stoning of a female Priscillianist; and thus the work of Ithacius was achieved. Thus, says Sulpicius, "were men unworthy to live put to death, or punished with exile, *pessimo exemplo*."

In looking at this most tragical case, one cannot but see that although it is commonly called the first precedent for the infliction of death on heretics, it was not so much for their heterodox speculations as for their alleged immoralities and sorceries, that Priscillian and his companions suffered the last penalty. Something must be allowed for the horror and panic which, some twelve years before, had been excited by the supposed discovery of widespread magic even in the highest classes of society. But, all deductions being made, on the ground that Maximus may have supposed, as he afterwards wrote to Pope Siricius, that he was called upon to crush out a conspiracy against public morals and therein against society, as proved by judicial confessions, the event of the Priscillianists' execution in 385 is one of the most deplorable in the fourth century; and Sulpicius is emphatic in affirming that, so far from arresting, it tended to stimulate the progress of the sect. The bodies of the "martyrs" were brought to Spain, and buried with pompous rites: the oaths taken "by the name of Priscillian," the spread of Priscillianist books, the intense feud lasting at least fifteen years between Priscillianists and Catholics, showed how the blood shed at Treves was, as it were, the "seed" of pertinacious heretical strength in the native land of the heresy; and we find Leo the Great, nearly sixty years after the death of Priscillian, occupying a long letter with what he considered to be an opportune and elaborate exposure of Priscillianist errors, by way of meeting, as he expresses it, a fresh outbreak of unsound teaching "from the relics of an ancient pestilence." What was even worse, the episcopal order was compromised by the partisanship of some of its members; and even the best men in the Christian body were involved in the obloquy thus excited against the Church.

Martin had striven to save the lives of these unhappy men. He had ere long, in 386, an opportunity of showing what he thought of those who had hunted them to death. He had occasion

to revisit Treves on an errand like his first, *i.e.* to plead for the lives of two Counts, Narses and Leucadius, who had been loyal to Gratian; and there he found a number of bishops assembled for the consecration of Felix to the see, in the place of Brito. All these prelates, except one, Theognostus (who openly censured their line), daily communicated with Ithacius. They had persuaded Maximus that he ought to send into Spain a commission of tribunes, with full power for searching out heretics, and punishing them with death and confiscation of property—a course, says Sulpicius, which would imperil many excellent persons, in that a pale face, or a peculiar dress, would be taken as a proof of heresy. Suddenly the news that Martin was coming shook their nerves: "they began to mutter and to tremble," lest Martin should refuse to communicate with them, and by his example should draw away others from their fellowship. They induced Maximus to send "officials" to meet Martin, and forbid him to proceed unless he would profess that he was at peace with the bishops assembled in the city. "I will come," answered Martin readily, "at peace with *Christ*." He entered Treves by night, came to the church for prayer, and then went to the palace to ask pardon for the persons in whom he was interested; but his main desire was to stop the sending of the inquisitorial commission. Maximus, who had shaken off the impressions formerly received, put off seeing him for one day; then for another; the bishops hastened to the Emperor, saying, "It is all over with us, if Martin backs up Theognostus! He ought never to have been allowed to enter the city; he comes as the avenger of the heretics, whom before he tried to defend; if he succeeds, Priscillian's death has been useless!" Maximus, it is said, was nearly persuaded to treat Martin as a Priscillianist; but he was overawed by the consciousness of the bishop's pre-eminent sanctity. He tried the effect of persuasive words; his former courtesies, he thought, had not been without fruit. "The heretics were put to death by form of civil law, not in consequence of any persecution by bishops. Theognostus is the only one of the bishops who holds aloof from his brethren, and he is acting from mere personal spleen; a few days ago, Ithacius was formally, in synod, pronounced guiltless: what ground can you allege for declining to communicate with him?" Martin was unmoved; Maximus angrily turned away, and presently ordered the execution of those prisoners for whom the bishop had come to plead. Eager to save their lives, Martin rushed to the palace, and promised to

communicate with the bishops if the bloody order were cancelled, and if the inquisitors were recalled from their southward journey. Maximus instantly and gladly assented; and on the next day, when Felix was to be consecrated, the bishop of Tours communicated with the other prelates, but refused to "confirm that communion by his signature." One does not see any logical ground for this refusal. Probably he already regretted what he had done, and tried to "draw a line" by refusing to sign any paper. He then hastily quitted Treves, with sore compunction for having, "even for an hour," entered into fellowship with the "Ithacians;" and while travelling through a vast and lonely wood, he sat down to think over the trouble, while his mind "by turns was accusing and defending him," and he imagined—probably in a dream—that an angel reassured him as to the amount of blame due to his concession. "Thou dost well to be grieved, but thou couldst not have got away on other terms: recover thy firmness, lest thou risk thy salvation." His biographer quotes Martin as saying that he felt, thenceforward, "some loss of wonder-working power;" and that, avoiding all further communion with the Ithacians, he never again during the sixteen remaining years of his life attended a meeting of bishops. Like Gregory Nazianzen, he had had painful experience of the spirit which sometimes reigned in such an assembly. Whatever may be thought of this latter extreme of caution, his noble protest against persecution—a protest in which, as we shall see, he was imitated by St. Ambrose—is *on the whole* a true representation of the patristic mind of the fourth century.

We must now return to the year 384, which was marked by the second, and far the most interesting and significant, of the four attempts made by the pagan senators of Rome to recover the altar of Victory which had been recently removed from their place of meeting, the Curia Julia, which stood on the north side of the Via Sacra, looking across the Comitium into the Forum. In it Augustus had placed an altar with a small image of the goddess of Victory represented as a winged maiden—"pennigeram puellam," says Prudentius—with smooth hair and bare feet, bedecked with rare jewels, and holding out a laurel wreath. "For centuries," as a great Roman antiquary expresses it, this statue "had been considered as the personification of the power and destinies of imperial Rome." It had been brought from Tarentum, and had kept its place in the senate-house until Constantius, or more probably Constans, was moved by Christian zeal to take it away. Naturally Julian had

restored it, and it had not been disturbed by the masterful but tolerant Valentinian I. Senators, on entering their hall, used to greet it with an offering of incense; and the pagan majority in the Curia, led by Aurelius Symmachus, Virius Flavianus, afterwards "the soul of a brief pagan restoration," and Vettius Prætextatus, whom Professor Dill calls "probably the best and most devout pagan of the age," would find in its presence a compensation for the annoyance caused by the inroad of Christian faith into the highest ranks of Roman society. The foreign "superstition" might have its stately churches, reared over the grave of its crucified apostle, or connected with the old home of the Laterani; its high priest might be a personage, bearing himself well-nigh like a prince, and enriched by the offerings of wealthy ladies; patricians of ancient name, Anicii, Acilii, Cornelii, might have apostatized from "the Father Best and Greatest" to the worship of a crucified Jew; but the principal scenes of that ignoble cult were at least far removed from the centre of Rome's corporate life, beyond the Tiber or near a south-eastern gate; and the traditions which had made Rome were still represented not only by more than four hundred temples, and by innumerable images in baths and porticoes and streets, but here in the home of the Conscript Fathers. But Gratian, who declined to be inaugurated as Pontifex Maximus, had also deprived them of this satisfaction; altar and image had been banished at his command, and their vacant place was a grievance which he had refused to abate in 382; the deputation sent to him had been counter-worked by Ambrose, and had not even obtained an audience. However, Gratian was gone, and a boy of fourteen reigned in his stead. The court of Milan, conscious of the difficulties which beset it, might now be more amenable to pressure—might think it a part of political common sense to conciliate the pagan aristocracy of Rome; and the man for the occasion was easily found in Symmachus as prefect of the city. He was in many respects a noble specimen of the pagan gentleman and official, a scholarly man, an accomplished orator, modest in bearing, public-spirited, and, with some drawbacks, amiable in disposition; his ideal was in the majestic past of Rome, and he clung to all that belonged to it. He had indeed failed on the former occasion; but now, in his capacity as chief magistrate, he was officially bound to report to the Emperor on the state of public affairs in Rome, and he turned this duty to account in the interest of a cause to which, as Gibbon puts it, he was devoted with "the

warmest zeal." It was not a zeal that would waste time in passionate declamation; it spoke in the tones of a dignified conservatism. "We request to have again that state of religious rites which was so long serviceable to the republic." It appealed to the Imperial obligations as not allowing ancestral usage to be violated: but ere long all appearance of peremptoriness is eschewed; "at least" let the connivance of recent emperors be a precedent; "at least" let the name, if not the deity, of Victory be kept in honour; "at least" let the senate-house have its ornaments unimpaired. The main topic of the plea is the argument from custom: Rome herself is introduced as asking leave to retain the rites amid which she has grown old. She is too old to change her mind; if she is to enjoy liberty, let her live in her own way. A connexion of cause and effect is assumed to exist between the ancient worship and the old-world repulses of the Gauls and of Hannibal. A remarkable argument followed, indicating a deep background of scepticism: various ceremonies have been assigned by "the deity" to various nations (here, like Ammianus, Symmachus adopts monotheistic phraseology); if reason is in the dark, the best thing to do is to adhere to traditionary observance. The "great secret of the universe" has to be reached, if at all, by various paths; Rome's path is not, he grants, the only one, but it is *hers*,—let that, in her case, be sufficient. Symmachus proceeded to plead for the restoration of the confiscated income of the Vestal Virgins: the treasury could not be really a gainer by annulling bequests, and seizing on the legal property of individuals; and to this argument from right was added the popular assumption which Symmachus probably employed without personally assimilating it—that a recent famine had its cause in a spoliation which was in fact sacrilegious. Further, the argument from a Christian prince's personal conscience was met by representing that he could have no responsibility in the matter, for it was not open to him to invade rights guaranteed by law—an important limitation of autocracy. His best course would be to cancel the act done in the misused name of his late half-brother. So spoke the accomplished representative of that aristocratic paganism of "the City," which Finlay reckons as a main cause of the break-up of the empire in the West. In truth, the pagan majority in the senate was the very concentration of that old Roman spirit, with its local gods and its Cæsar-worship, which encountered so powerful a solvent in Christianity.

Ambrose, on hearing of the prefectorial official report, could not wait until he obtained a sight of it; he must needs write at once to the young Emperor Valentinian by way of suggesting the topics of a reply. This seems to us rather hasty work, but we must remember his old instincts as a barrister, together with his passionate alarm at the very notion of a concession to "idolatry." How, he asks, can a Christian Emperor replace a pagan altar, which had been removed by his elder brother's deliberate mandate? Would not such an act on his part be anti-Christian? No pagan, however illustrious, however deserving of respect, has a right to direct his conduct; let the pagans be content with their legal liberties—no one compels them to join in Christian worship. (He avoids the question of "toleration all round.") They would respect straightforwardness of policy in a Christian government—would admit that "every one ought to maintain and stand by his own convictions" (a far-reaching proposition this). Then Ambrose, by an assumption which we cannot suppose him to have verified, affirmed that Christians already formed a majority in the senate, and that their feelings ought to be considered; only two years before, many Christian senators had invoked his aid against the concession then asked for! But just here he is conscious that it might be asked, "Why then did not these Christian senators vote against the petition in its favour?" and gives a singularly feeble answer: "Their absence spoke their minds." If the Emperor hesitates—perhaps under the influence of weak-kneed Christian advisers—let him consult Theodosius, as he does in all affairs of moment; if, unhappily, he were to yield, Ambrose, as bishop, would be bound to refuse his offerings in church, and to say, "Christ's altar spurns the gift of one who has made an altar to images" (another specimen of unfair rhetoric). The letter concludes with a reference to the just claim of Gratian's memory, and with the suggestion that their father's inaction in regard to the altar was sufficiently intelligible; no one had ever complained to him on the subject, and perhaps he had never even heard of the altar's existence.

Having thus written, Ambrose asked for and obtained a copy of the "report" of Symmachus. He then wrote what he describes as a "second *libellus*" to the Emperor, beginning with an assurance of confidence in Valentinian's piety, and an exhortation not to be misled by the brilliant oratory of the pagan pleader, "gold outside, brass or iron within—just like pagan religion." As to the argument

from Rome's past experience and present wishes: how about her misfortunes? were her gods to be blamed for them, as they were, it was urged, to be thanked for her successes? A naturalistic line is taken, which can only be pronounced incautious, as giving some advantage to secularism: Rome owed her greatness not to her religion or its rites, but to her own intrinsic courage and energy. The argument from her age might be retorted: why might she not, in maturity of thought, go with the times and be converted? As for the "great secret," it was no secret at all to Christians; it had been cleared up for them by Him whom pagans mocked at as a "God who had been crucified," while they themselves were deifying blocks of wood! As for Vestals, what a contrast between those poor seven amid all their splendid privileges, and the vast *concilium virginitatis* which had been formed by Christian faith! As for the withdrawal of public maintenance from the ministers of paganism, no one complained of laws disqualifying the clergy from inheriting by wills; they were under special restrictions as members of a local municipal body, for if they wanted to avoid the heavy burden of "curial" duties, they must first resign their own patrimony. Could paganism show such charities maintained by the lands of temples as by the Church that spent her property on the poor? Then returning to the purely conservative argument, Ambrose again employs a weapon which might afterwards with some plausibility have been turned against the Church—the argument from advance, progress, improvement in course of time. One might almost imagine that he was an evolutionist: the world gradually grew into shape; growth and development are a law of nature, illustrated by the daily expansion of sunlight, the due interval between seedtime and harvest, and the experience of every adult who has laid aside *mutati in annos ingenii rudimenta.* The age which has appreciated the faith of Christ is that which truly deserves to be called venerable: paganism represents the world's childhood; it is now, by intelligent preference of Christian truth to pagan error, that the human mind is becoming adult. One sees here the Christian advocate as a "progressive," the pagan as an "obstructive." Ambrose goes on to repeat what he had before said about the consideration due to Christian members of the Senate; and then once more borrows an argument from rationalism by treating the early death of Gratian as merely an instance of the vicissitudes of fortune, a turn of "the wheel" of human affairs. He did not consider that this might be construed into a denial of

belief in a moral Providence; and indeed the negative or destructive form thus given to his anti-pagan polemic may help us to understand why religious pagans were apt to associate Christianity with irreligion. "Both my papers," said Ambrose some years later, "were read in the Emperor's consistory," or privy council (the functions of which were properly judicial), "in presence of the Count Bauto, and of another high military officer, who had been a pagan from his childhood. Valentinian listened to my advice, and took no other step than the principles of our faith required." The opinion that the Emperor on this occasion decided against the counsel of all present appears from another passage to be erroneous; this, in fact, occurred on a later occasion, when for the fourth time the pagans renewed their request. On the occasion now before us, the second of the four, Ambrose guided the Emperor's mind, and the efforts of Symmachus were unavailing.

This was doubtless a great relief to the aged pope Damasus. He had had a long and troubled episcopate, and in 383, it seems, had vainly applied to Bassus, then prefect, for the aid of the civil power against Ephesius, who, as Marcellinus and Faustinus, the Luciferians, express it, had been "ordained bishop for the uncontaminated people of Rome." But though Bassus would not interfere, Ephesius appears to have voluntarily quitted Rome, in order to visit Palestine and Egypt. The Roman Churchmen had sympathized in the vexations of their prelate, to whom they were indebted for much that had increased their Church's outward majesty, and in particular for the foundation of a church of St. Laurence within the city, afterwards called by his own name, and retaining at the time of Pope Hadrian I. the paintings which he had given to it; also, probably, for not a little of that splendour of gold and marble for which, the Luciferian memorialists tell us, the Roman basilicas were already remarkable; but most especially for his labours in regard to the catacombs, in the recesses of which he had searched for the graves of the martyrs, removed the earth, widened the galleries, constructed flights of stairs to the more illustrious shrines, adorned the chambers with marble, admitted more air and light, supported the friable walls in some places with arches, and composed metrical inscriptions which were engraved on marble slabs by a sculptor named Dionysius Filocalus, in a peculiar character known as Damasine. There is a fine specimen in the "papal crypt" of the catacomb of St. Callistus in which, after describing a *turba piorum* there buried, Damasus "confessed"

that he would fain have marked out among them a grave for himself, but "feared to disturb their holy ashes." The greater accessibility of the cemeteries, owing to these works of his, led some of the Roman Churchpeople to use them again as places of burial; but this was not with the Pope's approval. Damasus was not only an encourager of Christian art in respect to the catacombs, but also wrote several poems, though of no great merit, on other subjects, one being a curious list of the titles of Christ, another an invocatory hymn on St. Andrew, another on virginity, another a prayer to our Lord in which He was besought to "cherish the Augustus;" and having collected the waters of the Vatican hill, which had damaged "the graves of the Saints," he turned them into fonts, and wrote two inscriptions over them, one of which contained the verse—

"Una Petri sedes, unum verumque lavacrum."

The old prelate had, we should infer, a lively stirring mind, as well as a firm will. After Jerome's second arrival at Rome, he was employed by Damasus as his secretary; and the Pope consulted him on Scripture difficulties. In one letter he tells Jerome that he had read commentaries, Greek and Latin, on the Gospels, and could not satisfy himself as to the sense of the word "Hosanna." In another he expresses the eager interest with which he read Jerome's letters; criticizes the wearisome verbosity of Lactantius; suggests that their correspondence shall turn on passages of Scripture, and asks what is meant by the sevenfold vengeance to be taken for Cain? If God created all things good, why did Noah distinguish clean and unclean beasts? How to reconcile a Septuagintal discrepancy as to the fourth or fifth generation at the Exodus? How was Abraham's circumcision a sign of his faith? Why was holy Isaac deceived by Jacob? How do you understand the parable of the prodigal and his brother? To all which queries Jerome returned elaborate answers.

It was also under the auspices of Damasus that he began at this time the great series of his works on the text of Scripture. Damasus set him a heavy task—"to sit as arbiter between the various Latin versions of the New Testament, and decide which of them agree with the Greek original." He foresaw that if he did this, he should be accused of irreverence, perhaps of sacrilegious falsification; but even hostile censors would allow that the original must be supreme over varying translations, ignorant emendations, or carelessness of copyists. He accordingly revised the existing

Latin version of the Gospels, altering only what seemed to spoil the sense of the Greek, and added to them the ten "canons" or tables of Eusebius which would show what passages belonged properly to this or that Gospel. He also revised the Latin Psalter, correcting it for the most part, although "cursorily," by the Septuagint, and so producing what is called the Roman Psalter, still used in St. Peter's. And he compared Aquila's version of the Old Testament with Hebrew MSS., in order to see, as he expressed it, whether "the synagogue, in its enmity against Christ," had misrepresented the original. At the Pope's request he translated two homilies of Origen on the Song of Solomon; and at this time he spoke of Origen with a respect which was afterwards used against "his own consistency." He wrote also a tract against Helvidius, a rustic and illiterate author who had denied the perpetual virginity of the Lord's Mother.

The general opinion of Roman Churchpeople was at this time distinctly favourable to Jerome; he was spoken of as holy, humble, learned, and was generally considered the fittest person for the bishopric when it should next be vacated. He had much happy intercourse with congenial souls, some of whom appear in his correspondence, and the most remarkable of his friendships were with devout ladies whom his absolutism of tone would not affront. Among these were Lea, who became "the head of a monastery and a mother of virgins," and died in 384; Marcella, who had talked to Athanasius, whose noble birth was no hindrance, after the close of a six months' married life, to the most thorough-going devotedness, who amid her asceticism continued to be "sweeter than all sweetness," and who made her family mansion on the Aventine the home of a female circle absorbed in religious interests, while she manifested an "incredible ardour" for Scriptural knowledge, and repeatedly consulted Jerome on such points as the meaning of the Divine names, the Hebrew letters distributed throughout Ps. cxix., or a hard phrase in Ps. cxxvi.; Asella, who at fifty retained vigorous health after a long course of strict asceticism, who worked with her hands, and seldom appeared in public; and the famous Paula, a widow of four years' standing whom Marcella had fired with an enthusiasm of ascetic self-dedication, in the glow of which she put aside the silk dress, the gold head-gear, the pearls and jewels, with which Roman ladies bedizened themselves, distributed her wealth among her children, spent all her time in devotion, and wept for her sins until her eyes were dim. The sudden rush from luxurious

self-indulgence to extremities of self-renunciation is observable in her daughters as in herself. Blæsilla had been married, and, like other rich ladies, spent hours at her toilet, and thought a feather-bed hardly soft enough for her repose; like Marcella, she lost her husband very soon after her marriage, and a long illness was followed by a determination to lead an ascetic life. Jerome, by way of consoling Paula, represented this change as a "sort of second baptism" whereby Blæsilla had become the "daughter of Christ;" anything like moderation of judgment in such a case was for him out of the question, and he exults in her adoption of a plain brown garb, and her perseverance in prayer until failing knees and eyes demanded sleep: the results were only too soon manifest. Her younger sister Eustochium was the first nobly born Roman girl to devote herself to religious celibacy, and ignored all the remonstrances of her pagan aunt Prætextata; and Jerome warns her against ostentation in devout habits,—"When you fast, keep your face cheerful,"—and mercilessly exposes the shams of affected piety. For some time he was happy enough as a student and a religious director; his letters exhibit a daily routine of work, devotion, and pious friendship. We see him beginning to dictate a reply to a letter from Damasus, when a Jew comes in laden with manuscripts borrowed from the synagogue: "Here is what you asked for." He had already, during his sojourn in Syria, begun the study of Hebrew, and he now plunges eagerly into comparison of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament with the several Greek versions: he reads a commentary on "the Song" by Rheticius of Autun, and does not think much of it. Friends call at his "hospitiolum;" he cannot refuse to see them, and so he has to shorten a letter: once at 10 p.m., after a hard day's work, a pain in the chest makes him pray for a little sleep. Or we find him in his lighter manner playfully returning the Pope's jests about his "laziness," offering to translate a work by Didymus of Alexandria on the Holy Spirit, telling Marcella that he knows she would like to stop his mouth when he grumbles at unreasonable critics, or thanking Eustochium for a present of pigeons and a basketful of cherries, which she has sent to mend his fare on St. Peter's Day. A quiet, laborious, enjoyable life, but destined to speedy and final interruption.

Damasus died, aged nearly eighty, on December 11, 384; and was speedily succeeded by Siricius, one of the priests of the city, elected, as an imperial letter asserts, by general acclamation—one of the first actions of whose pontificate was to reply to a letter

in which the bishop of Tarragona, Himerius by name, had consulted Damasus on certain points of discipline. Siricius, in true papal fashion, takes advantage of this reference to "the apostolic rock" to give not advice but authoritative orders, and directs converts from Arianism, like other converts from heresy, to be received without re-baptism; fixes Eastertide as the one ordinary time for baptism; excludes relapsed apostates from communion until their last hour; prescribes a gradual and orderly promotion to the priesthood and episcopate; and—which is the most important ruling in his letter—declares that Christian priests and deacons, if married, are bound (for the sake of their daily ministrations) to live with their wives as though they had none. The austerity of this rule, which was just what the venerable Paphnutius had prevented the Nicene Council from enacting, and which never commended itself to the Eastern Church, marks a point in the history of clerical celibacy; just as this earliest of the genuine "Decretals," itself professedly a determination of points proposed by the Spanish prelate (who is carefully informed that Rome is the head of *his* church), exhibits an important development in the theory of the powers and duties of the Roman see.

The accession of a new occupant of that see made a great change in the position of his predecessor's secretary and adviser. Jerome's popularity had begun to wane; people were tired of hearing him praised, and offended by his brusque uncourtly speech. He had not concealed his disgust at the luxury and arrogance of fine ladies professedly Christian, but rouged and overdressed—one of whom he had seen giving a blow to a poor old woman who approached her at St. Peter's in hopes of an alms. He could not but be indignant at the laxity and inconsistency of some of the Church virgins, and could as little refrain from contrasting such "widows indeed" as Paula and Marcella with others who made their independence an occasion of extravagant self-indulgence; he had advised Eustochium to shun their degrading society, and be deaf to the counsel, "My kitten, live your own life!" Nor had he spared the "worldly-minded clergymen" whom he saw repeating the mean and vulgar flattery of rich matrons which had made Valentinian I.'s restrictive law inevitable—spending the day in calls at grand houses, admiring a cushion or a handkerchief by way of obtaining it as a present, walking abroad with hair æsthetically arranged and rings glittering on their fingers, and hardly venturing

to put their delicate feet on a wet spot of ground. Still more unsparing was his criticism of self-seeking monks who wormed their way into favour with the rich, and pretended to fast while they repaid themselves by nightly revelry. Such men, and those whose tone was corrupted by their example, were sure to feel "the rough side" of Jerome's tongue, and to resent it. They took their revenge in sneers at his outward man and calumnies against his inward. "That look of his, that artificial smile, that measured walk, are all got up for a purpose; he has his own ends to serve: that sanctified demeanour covers—who knows what vice?" And then, as the venomous talk flowed on, suggestion became affirmation: "He is an impostor, a hypocrite; he takes his pleasure on the sly when he can do it without detection." Jerome himself tells us that this was said by some who had known him for three years, and who still to his face kept up the forms of respect. But an event ere long took place which gave the freest scope to vituperation. Blæsilla, exhausted by austerities which she had combined with Greek and Hebrew studies, died at twenty, after only a few weeks' illness, exhibiting the fanaticism of a youthful ascetic by asking her relatives around her bed to pray that Christ would pardon her for not fulfilling her purpose of monastic self-devotion, since time had not been allowed her. There could be no doubt of the cause of this early death: asceticism in her case, as in so many others, had passed from self-training into self-paining, and that with an abruptness which took no account of physical condition. At the funeral her mother was carried away fainting; forthwith a growl, or roar, of indignation amid the spectators: "Isn't this just what we said? she grieves now, too late, after her daughter has killed herself with fasting. It's the doing of that hateful set of monks! Drive them out of the city, stone them, fling them into Tiber!" Jerome, as the typical monk, became the mark for concentrated public aversion; *he* was the true author of all this misery that had come on a noble Roman house; he was this, he was that—not merely a morose censor of his neighbours, and a gloomy tormentor of himself and his dupes, but—and the word would come with a hiss of intensest hatred—a *maleficus*, a wizard, one of the dreaded and detested class which had been hunted down under Valentinian I. Some of the clergy, whom Jerome tersely labels as a "senate of Pharisees," joined in the outcry, and had the baseness to impute evil to his friendship with Paula, "whose song," as he says, "was a psalm, whose talk was of the Gospel, whose life was a fast."

Under this combination of enmities Rome became too hot to hold him: he writes that he ought not to have expected to be able to sing the Lord's song in so strange a land. In August 385 he abruptly parted from his Roman friends and left Italy for the East, making a short stay at Jerusalem in the early part of 386, remaining for some four weeks at Alexandria in order to confer with the famous blind scholar Didymus, and then settling himself at Bethlehem, amid scenes long hallowed to every Christian heart and visited by pilgrims from every part of Christendom—pilgrims whose tender devotion to the Son of Mary made "His own village" a quiet sanctuary of prayer and peace, where men sang "Alleluia" as they held the plough, and reapers and vine-dressers cheered their toil with psalmody, and foreigners from as far as Britain won esteem by their charity and unselfishness. Here, then, the most learned and studious, yet the most sensitive and polemical, mind of that age devoted itself to work and meditation, to prayer and penitential exercises, in a cell lying (as we find from his work on "Hebrew Places") a little way off the public road, not far from what was shown as the tomb of Archelaus. Thither Paula, accompanied by Eustochium, soon followed him, disregarding the grief of her little son Toxotius, who lived to marry Læta, the pious daughter of a learned and kindly old pagan aristocrat named Albinus, of whose conversion Jerome professed to entertain some hope. Paula founded a "double monastery" for men and for women, the prototype of several in England and France, such as those at Whitby, Barking, Brie, and Autun. Jerome, delighting in Paula's society and sympathy, to which he attempted unsuccessfully to add Marcella's, was the more inspirited to carry on his theological studies, receiving further instructions in Hebrew from a Jew named Baranina—Rufinus nicknames him Barabbas—who, for a high fee, was induced to come to him by night.

Bethlehem belonged to the diocese of Jerusalem; and Cyril, now approaching the close of his long episcopate, and ruling his Church with undisputed authority, was probably able by this time to correct some of the moral and social disorders which five years before had drawn from Gregory Nyssen a tract dissuasive of pilgrimages to Palestine, and also to overcome a schismatic and heterodox faction which had anticipated the Nestorian severance between the Christ and the eternal Son. In the later days, then, of the great Catechist bishop, there was peace in the Church of the

Holy Places; and yet there could hardly be much cordiality between the recluse of Bethlelem, the austere theologian ordained by Paulinus, and the prelate of orthodox faith but Semi-Arian antecedents, who regarded Flavian as the rightful bishop of Antioch, and of whom Jerome in his Chronicle tells a story at once scandalous and unsupported. However, Cyril had little time for controversial feeling; he was drawing near his end: and that end came, as it seems, in the year 386—the year after Jerome's arrival in the East—and perhaps as early as March. He was succeeded in the see of Jerusalem by John, who became remarkable, some ten years later, for his controversy with Jerome on the interminable question about Origen, and subsequently for his unfortunate connexion with Pelagius.

CHAPTER XXIV.

ST. AMBROSE AND JUSTINA.

We must now turn our attention to some of the most vivid and dramatic scenes in the Church history of the fourth century—to events which are, perhaps, of central and signal interest, even in the fruitful and majestic episcopate of St. Ambrose. Justina, as we have seen, had found it needful to stifle her dislike of the Catholic archbishop, and to lean on his loyalty in the crisis which followed the murder of Gratian. Nor had she interfered with the influence which that high and princely spirit exercised over her son's counsels in the dispute between pagan and Christian about the altar of Victory. But she was only biding her time. She had, of course, a circle of Arian courtiers and attendants, many of them Goths, of whom Ambrose sarcastically observes that just as "waggons" had been the homes of their nomad forefathers, so now a "waggon"—the chariot of their imperial mistress—was their church. Early in 385, she began to devise a scheme for appropriating to their use, at the coming Easter, one of the basilicas of Milan—those churches in which the Nicene faith was now confessed by a community which was, indeed, the great mass of the Milanese population. The scheme was matured, and Ambrose was summoned to the palace; there, in presence of the officials who formed the imperial "consistory," he was ordered to make over to the Emperor, for the use of the Arian Court, the Portian basilica, which stood outside of the city, beyond the western wall, and is represented by St. Victor's, west of the Porta Sant' Ambrogio. He refused with the "firmness that became a bishop." Almost while he gave the answer, a violent disturbance at the palace gates interrupted the interview. The people had heard of his enforced visit to the palace; they rose in menacing strength, and a military count was sent out with light

troops to disperse them. They stood firm, protesting that they were ready to die for the faith of Christ: the court dignitaries, in perplexity, begged Ambrose, as a favour, to go out and assure them "that no one would invade a basilica belonging to the church." He complied, and induced them to return home; and thus, for the time, the attempt of the Empress was baffled, although Ambrose was deemed answerable for the popular disturbance.

Ambrose must have known that the scheme would not be abandoned; and, in fact, on Friday in the fifth week of Lent, April 4, after the excitement had somewhat abated, a new and more audacious demand was made. Some counts who had seats in the consistory required the archbishop, in the Emperor's name, to give up, not the Portian, but a large new basilica within the city, cruciform in shape, recently dedicated to the Apostles, and sometimes called "the Roman," because near the Roman Gate. He refused as before, saying as of course, that "God's temple could not be surrendered by a bishop;" and on Saturday, at the service (which at Milan, as in the East, was of a festal character), he announced this new demand and his refusal: the people, by acclamations, applauded the line which he had taken; the prætorian prefect himself appeared at the church, and dropping the imperious tone which had proved so fruitless, fell back, on behalf of the Empress, on a request that they would at least not insist on withholding the Portian basilica, which, not being intramural, might be asked for with less offence. The people would not hear of it. "Then," said the prefect, "I must inform the Emperor." The next day was Palm Sunday: the archbishop officiated, apparently, in the "new" or "greater" church; the lessons were read, the sermon preached, the ordinary catechumens dismissed; and some who were at the very end of their catechumenate, being "competents," or candidates for baptism on the following Holy Saturday, went as usual into the baptistery, where Ambrose began the ceremony called the "Delivery of the Creed," always performed on that day in the Church of Milan, as in Spain and Gaul. He recited the Creed, and explained it in detail, with a view to their learning it by heart and repeating it intelligently before their baptism. While he was thus engaged, the startling news came that officers called "decani," a kind of lictors, were actually in the Portian basilica setting up those hangings or curtains which, as being adjuncts of the imperial state, indicated that a place or building was imperial property. "Some of the people are on their way thither," added the messenger:

"there will be a disturbance." "But," writes Ambrose with a grand simplicity, "I continued at my duty, and began to perform Mass,"—the solemn liturgy of the faithful, called *missa* because it succeeded the dismissal of the catechumens. That this is the sense of the word here is shown by what follows: "While I was making the oblation, I heard that the people had seized one Castulus, whom the Arians called a presbyter: while passing along" (*i.e.* towards the Portian basilica), "they had met him in the street. I began to weep most bitterly, and in the very act of oblation to pray to God, that He would give His help, so that no one's blood might be shed in the Church's quarrel—or at least that mine might be poured out, not only for the safety of the people, but also for the impious themselves." He sent out some priests and deacons who were assisting him at the Celebration, "and so rescued the man from ill-treatment." So far as we can infer, nothing more was done on that Sunday as to the occupation of the Portian church; but on the next day, and the day following, the Catholic body in Milan were severely punished, as for a new "seditious" tumult in which a chaplain, so to speak, of the Empress had incurred serious peril. By orders from the court, "the whole body of merchants" or tradespeople were arrested, imprisoned, heavily fined: so that "the sacred days of that last week, in which it was usual to release debtors," were spent by these poor citizens in the utmost distress and discomfort; they were commanded to pay to the Emperor, in three days, two hundred pounds' weight of gold, and bravely answered, "That, or double of that, and welcome, so that we keep our faith!" Even the clerks in the Government offices, the messengers called "agents in the Emperor's affairs" (who were really official spies), the subordinates of magistrates, received orders to keep within doors, "lest they should be mixed up with any tumult;" the higher officials, or men of civil dignity, were threatened with severe penalties in case they did not promote the surrender of the church.

It was apparently on Tuesday that the archbishop had another interview with "counts and tribunes," who ordered him to make over the Portian church without more delay. An argument followed. Ambrose, apparently, repeated his ground of refusal: "The churches cannot be alienated or surrendered." "Yes, they can—to the Emperor; he has absolute rights, and he is but claiming them: everything belongs to him,"—the unmitigated Cæsarean principle of the time. "Not so," said the great Christian champion of a principle which was destined to put Cæsarism to rebuke; "he is

not the master of everything; let him ask me to give him what is my own to give, be it money or land, and although he has no right to claim it, I will not refuse it; let him take all: but not what belongs to God, such as churches, which are held by the bishop in trust for Him." The officials lowered their tone: "Surely the Emperor has a right to have *one* church in which he can conscientiously worship." "No, for such a church would become adulterous as not lawfully espoused to Christ" (a curious and not very edifying transfer of the spiritual character to the material fabric): "if I am even sentenced to death, I will not fence myself in with a crowd, nor clasp the altar as a refuge"—alluding, of course, to the sanctuary-privilege which had become attached to churches, and had hardly as yet become an abuse. He was sincerely afraid of causing a collision between the imperial troops and the people: he would have done anything to avert such a calamity, which would have been the ruin of Milan. "It is your duty," he was told, "to keep the people quiet." His answer was prompt: "It is my duty not to excite them; to quiet them is in God's power, not mine. If you think I have stirred them up, let me be sent into exile." The officials withdrew, and Ambrose spent the rest of the day in what he calls the "old basilica," by which he probably means a church within the walls, of older foundation than the "Apostles'" or "Roman" church, and thence he went home for the night, his dwelling being probably adjacent to the latter or "new" church. On Wednesday morning, before daylight, as he crossed the threshold to perform service in this church, he found it beset with soldiers. He therefore went to the "old" church, where the service included Psalm lxxix., *Deus venerunt* (the first words of which were sung "with expression"), and the lessons were being read when Ambrose learned that the new church also was fuller of people than had been usual before these troubles, and that the congregation wanted a reader for the accustomed Holy Week lessons from Job. The very soldiers began to mingle with the congregation in the old church, reassuring them with the words, "We are come to pray, and not to fight;" and it was reported that they had already let the Emperor know that their sympathies were with the Catholics and Ambrose. Thus relieved of immediate alarm, the people showed considerable moderation for a sensitive and deeply moved crowd of Italians. Apostrophizing the Emperor, they exclaimed, "We do not mean to fight, O Augustus; we are not afraid of you, but we petition you." Then they turned to their

bishop, and deliberately asked him to transfer the whole assembly to the larger or "new" church, where his presence was earnestly desired. His answer was indirect, but it seemed to intimate that if he were to go to the new church, the government might be provoked to take extreme measures, which would end in a tragical conflict; but by way of doing something to occupy the people, he began to preach on what had been read from the book of Job, and so glided naturally from the general subject of patience into a narrative of recent trials. While he was speaking, joyful news arrived: "The imperial hangings in the new church are being taken down and folded up; the multitude there assembled are calling out for you!" He pursued his discourse in a strain of thanksgiving, but still, as a matter of caution, declined to visit the new church; however, he sent thither two priests, and was presently informed that an imperial secretary wanted to see him. Ambrose went aside with the visitor, who said bluntly in the Emperor's name, "I want to know whether you are a usurper" (that is, "whether you are plotting against my sovereign authority"): "why have you sent presbyters to the church?" "I sent them," answered Ambrose, "instead of going myself, and said I trusted that the Emperor himself would now be on our side. We bishops are not supposed to envy emperors, it is rather emperors who have wished to be bishops: *my* sovereignty is in my weakness" (alluding to 2 Cor. xii. 10); and he added that Maximus well knew how he, Ambrose, had protected Valentinian from his attack. He spent the day in the same church and said the psalms with his "brethren" in what he calls its "smaller basilica"—perhaps its baptistery chapel.

Maundy Thursday came: the book of Jonah was read as usual: Ambrose applied it to the existing situation; and then came the end of present difficulties. "The Emperor has ordered the soldiers to withdraw from the basilica, and the fines exacted from the merchants to be repaid." The church rang with joyous applause and fervid thanksgivings appropriate to the day on which Church penances were solemnly "relaxed." The soldiers vied with each other in assuring the people of the good news, in rushing up to the altar, and kissing it in token of peace. Ambrose knew too well that this was likely to be but a lull in the storm. The Emperor, he was told, spoke angrily of him as "a usurper and worse;" and when some counts begged their master to "come out from his palace and visit the church, in compliance with the soldiers' desire," the boy answered, "If Ambrose gave you the

order, you would give me over to him as a prisoner"—an outbreak of temper which excited much alarm. "But," writes the bishop, "he has those who are ready to stimulate his anger"—among whom was his chamberlain Calligonus, who had the insolence to send this message to Ambrose: "Do you despise Valentinian while I am alive? I will take off your head!" "May God permit you," replied Ambrose, "to do what you threaten: I am ready to suffer as a bishop!"

The rest of the year passed away quietly enough. But in the beginning of 386 we find Justina and her son renewing their attempts against Ambrose—or rather, perhaps, one should excuse Valentinian from more blame than could be attached to a youth for acquiescing in his mother's policy. She had now at hand a confidant in the person of Mercurinus, an Arian, who was represented as a bishop. He was, according to Ambrose, of Scythian extraction, and had thought fit at once to veil some scandals in his past life, and to attract the regard of the few Arians in Northern Italy, by assuming the name of that astute and ready-witted predecessor of Ambrose whose abilities Athanasius had perhaps underrated, since his advocacy of "Homœan" Arianism had been successful enough to provoke Hilary to denounce him as an Antichrist. The little Arian court-circle had now, therefore, an Auxentius II. as their chosen prelate; and he imitated his so-called namesake by exalting the authority of the Council of Ariminum, while exceeding him, as it seems, by rebaptizing renegade Catholics. It was he, we are assured, who devised a new edict, granting liberty of worship to all who held the doctrines of that Council, and adding a significant menace to those "who think that they alone have had liberty of assembling granted to them:" such persons should know that if they attempted to make any disturbance in contravention of the present edict, they would be put to death, not only as troublers of the Church's peace, but as traitors; and a like punishment would await those who even ventured to petition privately against the new law. It was the duty of the secretary of state, Benevolus, to draw out laws resolved on by the Emperor. But Benevolus, although only a catechumen, was ardently attached to the Catholic faith. He refused to act on this occasion. Offers of high promotion were made in vain: "Rather," he cried, "take away my present office;" and, so saying, he flung the belt, which is referred to in the Nicene canons as the badge of the imperial service, at the feet of Justina, and retired into privacy at Brescia,

where, having received baptism, he adorned by a consistent piety the faith for which he had sacrificed his worldly prospects. It would appear that the hand which actually penned the edict, after Benevolus had thus declined the task, was that of its real author, bishop "Auxentius." It was duly published on the 23rd of January, 386.

And now began a worse trouble than that of the preceding year: it was not now a question of appropriating a single church for Arian services; the prospect before the Western Church, wherever the power of Valentinian was recognised, might be called by excitable minds the first scene of a new persecution. Ambrose encouraged this excitement by exaggerating the actual effect of the law, when he calls it "blood-stained," and says that it would involve the expulsion of bishops and capital punishment of those who resisted it, and the proscription of "curiales" or municipal office-bearers who might fail to carry it out. In itself it did not affect the position of "Nicene" Churchmen: but he viewed it in its most threatening light, and saw in it all that it might lead to; on all sides he heard Churchmen expressing their anguish and alarm at the mere notion of a re-establishment of the authority of "the Ariminian creed," and of a doom of death against all who should "resist" or even "deprecate" the enforcement of the law.

Justina began her direct attack upon Ambrose by sending a tribune named Dalmatius to summon him before the imperial consistory, there to dispute or plead against Auxentius on the great doctrinal issue between them. "You are to choose umpires, as Auxentius has done:"—the persons named by Auxentius were, Ambrose surmised, four or five unbelievers, but their names were not mentioned by Dalmatius. He added that the pleadings would be before Valentinian as chief arbiter; and that, if Ambrose did not choose to appear, he might leave Milan, and those who wished might follow him. The archbishop consulted some bishops who were at hand as to the answer which he should give; and then wrote his famous letter to Valentinian, in which he intimated with dignity and decision that he could accept neither alternative. He could not plead, in a cause of faith, before a secular tribunal; he referred to an express rescript of Valentinian I. (given after the dispute as to the Papal election, see p. 364) to the effect that in cases where the faith, or ecclesiastics as such, were concerned, "the judge ought to be one who is neither unequal in office nor dissimilar in right"—in other words, that questions purely ecclesiastical should be tried by bishops, not by the Emperor. "When,"

asks Ambrose, "did you ever hear, most gracious Emperor, that in a cause of faith laymen judged about a bishop? . . . if a bishop is to be taught by a layman, what will follow? that the layman should dispute upon theology, and the bishop listen." After this *reductio ad absurdum*, he goes on to tell the lad of fifteen whom he is addressing, that some day he will be older, and then he will know what to think of a bishop who by accepting this claim could lay the episcopal authority under the feet of laymen. Then came a home-thrust: "Is your Grace to claim jurisdiction as to a doctrinal controversy, when you, being still unbaptized, are a stranger to the sacraments of faith?" He challenged Auxentius to let his "judges" or umpires come with him to church, and there let the people of Milan decide between their own bishop and the pretender—thus attributing to the Church laity a certain responsibility for the maintenance of true doctrine—without insisting on the unanimous opinion which long ago they expressed about Ambrose himself, or on Valentinian I.'s promise that, if Ambrose would accept the bishopric, he should occupy it undisturbed. He proceeded very ingeniously to show that by ordering this dispute in the Consistory, the Emperor had rescinded, in part, the recent law which he was specially bound to uphold: for if it were to be strictly construed, any layman who took the Catholic side, and objected to the legalisation of Arian profession under the new law, might be held to have forfeited his life; and how could Ambrose ask any one to incur that peril by acting as his umpire? (The ex-barrister and ex-magistrate must have felt some complacency in giving this unexpected turn to the discussion.) Nor again could he, in the opinion of his brother prelates, or consistently with his own sense of duty, appear before judges who might possibly not be Christians, nor discuss the faith save in a church and before a synod. There he would willingly meet Auxentius—there, but not elsewhere. Then as to the second alternative: his brethren agreed with him in thinking that he could not voluntarily abandon his flock, and thus "betray the altar of Christ and surrender the heritage of the Lord." It had been in the power of the government to arrest him;—as he afterwards said, there were daily opportunities of doing so, while he went about his pastoral work or traversed a road in the vicinity of the palace; and if his exile were desired, he should have been sent away by force, not bidden to take himself off and so accept an intolerable responsibility. He concluded by saying that he would place himself, even now, at the

Emperor's disposal, if only he could be assured that the Church of Milan would not be given over to Arians. With an affectation of inexperience, half concealing an ironical reproach, he declared that he knew not how to behave in an imperial consistory—except for the purpose of pleading before a Maximus on behalf of a Valentinian; and that he could hold no controversy within a palace, for he neither understood nor wished to understand the mysteries of its atmosphere. To this memorial, which showed that his hand had not lost its former cunning, he appended his signature; "I Ambrose, Bishop, present this *libellus* to the most gracious Emperor and Augustus, Valentinian."

It would seem that the court, on receiving the memorial, renewed its attempt to make him give up at least the Portian church and its sacred vessels. He answered as before, that he would make no difficulty about giving up anything that was personally his own, but that the church was "the inheritance of his fathers" (1 Kings xxi. 3) and predecessors, or rather of Christ Himself: of it he was not the owner, but the trustee; and to betray such a trust would be to incur guilt for himself, and to do the Emperor no real service. Baffled on this point, the court—that is, Justina as its leading spirit—recurred to a proposal which he had already dealt with. "Let him go away,—whither he pleases, if he will only leave Milan." It illustrates the working of Cæsarism to learn that he had expected a capital sentence; but he answered as before, "I cannot go by my own act;" and he took steps for keeping himself safe from a forcible expulsion by removing into the precincts of the "new" church. Externally, it was forthwith guarded by soldiers: but the people thronged its interior, kept watch there for several nights and days, and did their best to secure its doors from being forced, although, in spite of all such care, some folding doors and a passage were ere long found to be open—a blind man, it was said, had left them open, when he went home. The distress and excitement of the people during these self-imposed vigils in circumstances of hourly anxiety and alarm, appeared in the change of mood which would be natural to men of impulsive Southern temperament. "Let Auxentius take himself off with that law of his!" and again, "Will the bishop himself leave us?" or, "There's a carriage got ready to carry him off, and he will be seized before our eyes!" He knew that the one thing to do was to calm their agitation, to give them a new subject of interest; and he did much more than he understood for Western Christendom when he taught

them to chant the psalms antiphonally, after the custom of Eastern churches. To this he added some hymns of his own, composed, perhaps, in part, for the occasion—among them that one which for simplicity, serenity, and tenderness may match the evening hymn of our own Bishop Ken, and which soothed Augustine's dumb grief on the night after his mother's burial, *Deus Creator omnium.* One can well imagine how, as the soft lights of the March sunset gleamed and faded along the columns of the great church, there rose up and resounded through its aisles the pathetic thanksgiving for the gift of nightly repose, which might "prepare the body for the morrow's labours, relieve the overburdened mind, and relax the pressure of sorrowful anxiety," followed up, as it was, by a prayer for the protection of the Trinity "as Almighty and as One:" how kindling and invigorating at daybreak would be the *Splendor Paternæ gloriæ,* with its entreaty that "the true Sun, the Light issuing from Light, would shed over souls a perpetual radiance," and how exultantly, at the close of that hymn, these fervent Trinitarians would proclaim the coinherence of "the whole Son in the Father, and the whole Father in the Word."

And here it is impossible not to pause and think of the effect of these stirring scenes on one who seems to have been present in the church, although as yet only an inquirer who did not clearly see his way. For it is at this point that a great name, a greater even than that of Ambrose, comes before us; it is now that Augustine sets his foot on the stage of Church history. He was a rhetoric professor, by governmental appointment, in the public schools of Milan, and as such lectured to youths who had already gone through the extensive curriculum then summarised as "grammar." He was in his thirty-second year; and if, with the help of his inestimable autobiography, we look back from this standing-ground to landmarks in his earlier life, we see him first as a clever and sensitive boy, born in 354 to Patricius, a careless father in the lower middle class, and Monnica, one of the pattern mothers of history, going to a day school at his native Numidian town of Thagaste, enjoying Virgil lessons, but disliking Greek—a dislike which had important results on his after-career as a theologian. He is removed to a higher school at Madaura, in order to carry on grammar studies more fully, and to begin rhetoric with a view to practice at the bar. He returns home, a lad of sixteen, technically a catechumen, but unbaptized, and falls in with idle and mischievous comrades who successfully dare him to join in robbing

a neighbour's pear tree, although, as he frankly says, he could get better fruit at home. Then, by the generous help of a rich fellow-townsman named Romanianus, he is "sent up to the University" of Carthage, and soon distinguishes himself among the students; he holds aloof from the wild doings of a "fast set," but intellectual interests do not suffice him without sensual excitement; he catches the malaria of Carthaginian vice, and takes pleasure in defying moral restraints, as one who "hated a path free of snares." It is the case of a nature that insists on buying its own experience: with a deep restlessness that wanted *something*, he knew not what, which could satisfy his cravings and bring order into his turbid life, he tried this and that,—"foul wells" or purer waters,—the emotionalism of the theatre, the attraction of lawless love, the literary charm of "books of eloquence." Out of these last came help of a kind; the downward course was checked in his nineteenth year by the reading of Cicero's *Hortensius*, which made him long after "wisdom;" but when he took up the Scriptures on the chance of finding it there, he was repelled by the homeliness of their style, which affronted his academic taste. In his thirst for knowledge, and for a "rational" account of things divine, he is allured by the sonorous promises of Manicheism, and infects some of his fellows with his own susceptibility to the pretensions of that fantastic theory of the universe, decked out in Christian phrases which thinly veiled its antichristian character, but without which his recollections of his mother's teaching would have made him put it aside at once. He returns home after some four years, and there teaches rhetoric. Monnica grieves over his alienation from Christianity, and is soothed by a bishop's assurance that "the son of such tears could never be lost." The death of a dear friend makes Thagaste dreary, and he accepts a professorship at Carthage in 378. The internal incoherence still pursues him; "the whole of his nature," as Dr. Bigg puts it, is still "at war;" yet he is brilliantly successful as a teacher, writes on "the Fair and the Fitting," begins to see difficulties (especially connected with physical facts) in the Manichean dogmatism, is told that when Faustus, a leading Manichean, next pays a visit to Carthage, he will clear up everything. Faustus comes, but Augustine finds him superficial: and this discovery in 383 checks his interest in Manicheism; he adopts a "waiting" attitude, and inclines towards "Academic" suspense of opinion. Then comes the offer of a professorship at Rome, which would obviously be an

advance in the career on which he had entered: he resolves to accept it, conceals his purpose from Monnica, and sails for Rome; but he finds that the Roman students, although not so insolent and unruly as some of those at Carthage, were otherwise unsatisfactory, for they would not pay him his due fees. His internal state was that of one who had gone through a long series of disillusionments: if Manicheism as a whole had lost its hold over his mind, he clung to parts of it which seemed to deaden the sense of responsibility, and he still regarded the Christianity of the Church as superstitious and anthropomorphic; it is this which gives to his case such a modern character. Weary of Rome, he accepts a professorship at Milan: thither Monnica follows him; and there he lives with her and his friends Alypius and Nebridius. He goes to church, hears Ambrose preach, thinks his sermons graceful but quite unconvincing; however, by degrees he comes to find that this and that objection to Christian faith will not hold water. The upward movement has begun, but has much to check it: as he himself learned to think, he was being led through strange ways, and with not a few pauses, as by a Hand that could bide its own time. Passion and ambition disturb his search after truth: if he sees, though dimly, that the Catholic idea of God is not unworthy, if he takes the hint that Old Testament difficulties may be modified by a so-called spiritual interpretation, if he perceives that truth is not an irrational principle, that Catholic Christianity has a good deal to say for itself, and that he has no time to lose if he means to form some definite convictions,—still "the world is too much with him," the prospect of a brilliant marriage dazzles him, the awful problem of the origin of evil presses him down. As before, he is driven this way and that, and finds no rest: again, as at Carthage, philosophy comes to his aid; he sees what is true in Platonism, and wherein it falls short; it cannot "meet the demands of his conscience." At last, all the intellectual or speculative objections to Christianity drop off one after another: but this does not of itself secure his conversion; although the idea of a divine presence, the awe of a future judgment, are permanent in his thoughts, old habits and old cravings persistently assert themselves. Such is his position in that spring of 386: he has begun to ask whether Ambrose's teaching may not be as true as it is eloquent; and with this growing interest in it, as not, after all, suggesting a low idea of the divine nature, and as likely, after all, to supply a clue to the maze of life, he would stand amid the throng that listened to the

bishop on that Palm Sunday—the second of two memorable Palm Sundays—and would surely learn something of that pastoral love for the flock of which his own episcopate was to be so rich and so complete an illustration.

The sermon of Ambrose is entitled "Against Auxentius." "I see," he begins, "that you are unusually excited." In fact, they were earnestly watching his every movement, as if in fear that he would leave them. He explained the reasons which he had given to the court for declining either to argue the doctrinal question in the palace, or to accept permission, or even obey a subsequent order, to depart. They need not fear, he says, that he would abandon them. They knew him to be accustomed to show all due deference to sovereigns, but not to give way to them; he would remain at his post; but if such a trial as his enforced separation from them were imminent, not all their affectionate solicitude to keep him safe within the basilica could avert what Christ would in that case have willed. He, Jesus, was in their belief Almighty; therefore whatever He commanded would assuredly take place; and by a quaint application of the message given as to the ass's colt, he added that the Lord might have need of him; anyway, Christ's servant was in Christ's own hands. Examples in sacred history would prove the efficacy of angelic protection and of the Church's intercession; and then came the beautiful story of *Domine, quo vadis?* of which even such a historical critic as Bishop Lightfoot could ask in his "Ordination Addresses," "Why should we not believe it true? is it not far beyond the reach of invention?" Ambrose went on to urge the duty of quiet trustfulness: if they heard that his safety was menaced, let them not lose heart; and here he adverted to passages of Scripture which had been read—the 50th Psalm, the story of Naboth, and the Triumphal Entry—as to which he was irresistibly tempted to make the money-changers symbolic of the intrusive Arian bishop who would fain "sell the simple minds of the faithful." After noticing the imputation of "disrespect to the sovereign," and commenting (in a rather far-fetched way) on the passage in the Gospels about tribute money, he observed that there was no question of denying to the State its lawful tribute from Church lands; he condescended to remark on the paltry attempts to make him obnoxious on account of the money bestowed by the Church on "Christ's own poor," and to represent him as having, just lately, abused the people's sensibility by the "religious excitement" of his Trinitarian hymns. One other momentous sentence, uttered

with all his energy, must have thrilled through that crowd in the basilica with the significance which belongs to a terse formula condensing a great thought: "The Emperor is within the Church, not above the Church." It was, says De Broglie, "the concise expression of a revolution accomplished: Church power had now raised its head above the imperial majesty"—but only within the religious area itself.

The immediate alarm passed by; the bishop and his people were able to return to their ordinary employments, and even to proceed in the middle of June to the dedication of a newly finished church, the "Ambrosian." They asked him to let the service be exactly like that which had been performed at the dedication of the "Roman Church," otherwise called "the New Basilica." "It shall be so," said Ambrose, "if I can find any relics of martyrs to place in the church;" a saying which unfortunately illustrates the growth of a "cultus" destined to be fruitful in gross frauds, and highly unfavourable to spiritual religion. Then, he says, he felt a presentiment that some would be found in front of the chancel-screen of a church dedicated to SS. Felix and Nabor, two Milanese martyrs; and, on digging there, two skeletons of unusual size were found with heads separated from the bodies, and "traces," as De Broglie expresses it, "of a bloody execution." For two days crowds visited the spot: the remains, carefully arranged, and covered with linen, were carried on the second evening to the basilica of Fausta, where vigils were kept all night, and some supposed demoniacs received imposition of hands from Ambrose. Next day, the relics, identified, on the authority of some old men's memories, with the bodies of two martyrs traditionally known as Gervasius and Protasius, were carried in procession to the Ambrosian church, the dedication of which was thus signalised by their discovery. Ambrose assures us that many sick persons who pressed near to touch the wrappings of the dead martyrs felt immediate relief; and especially that a blind man, named Severus, who had been a butcher before he lost his eyesight, recovered it after thus coming into contact with "the sacred remains,"—a statement amplified by Augustine's recollection of those days into a somewhat fuller story, which substitutes uncorrupt bodies for skeletons. A third witness to this incident is a brief statement in the Life of Ambrose, written either in 412 or 413 by Paulinus; he adds that at the time of his writing Severus was still alive, "serving religiously in the Ambrosian church, as it was called—the same to which the martyrs' bodies were transferred."

Ambrose, at the moment when the procession arrived at the Ambrosian basilica, felt too much overpowered to preach; but when the series of lessons began to be read, including Psalms xix. and cxiii., and the account of Elisha at Dothan, thoughts appropriate for a sermon at such a time came into his mind, and were expressed in a fervid address, concluding with a proposal to bury the remains below the altar, in the place which he had previously intended for himself. The people wished to have this burial, or "deposition," deferred until the next Sunday; but Ambrose persuaded them to let it be done on the following day. That day, accordingly, saw the Ambrosian church again crowded: but in the interval, as Ambrose frankly told the people, the Arians had denied that the remains were those of martyrs, or that any persons had been relieved of demoniacal possession, or that Severus had really been blind before he touched the fringe of the pall. In answer to this, Ambrose protested that he had heard those on whom his hands had been laid, declaring that no one could be saved who did not own the Trinity; and that Severus could prove, if need were, his previous blindness by the evidence of those on whose help, in his dependent state, he had relied. Of course, the case of the man born blind, who said, "Whereas I was blind, now I see," was adduced as just in point. The Arians continued incredulous; and, if Paulinus can be trusted, a man who cried out against Arianism was seized by them and drowned in a fish-pond; but a vehement Arian declared that he had seen an angel whispering in the ear of Ambrose while he preached, and was thereupon converted to the faith thus guaranteed. It is much easier to suppose that Ambrose was himself too easy of belief as to statements which fell in with his own strong wishes, than to think that a "miracle" was wrought in support of a growing superstition. But the circumstances, altogether, were unfavourable to Justina and Auxentius; and still more, perhaps, was the step taken by the Emperor Maximus, who wrote in a style of grave admonition to his youthful brother-monarch. "If," he said, "I were not honestly your friend, I might serve my own interests out of the disturbance of Catholics which is said to go on in the dominions of your Tranquillity. But I am closely connected with your most serene youth by ties of friendship, and I must warn you to consider, as in God's presence, what it is to treat Catholic churches with violence, to besiege bishops in their basilicas, to decree fines and death-penalties, and overturn the most holy Law" (*i.e.* the Catholic religion) "under the name of

I know not whom." He proceeded to claim as on the side of Catholicism "all Italy, Africa, Gaul, Aquitania, Spain, and venerable Rome herself," pre-eminent for orthodoxy as for all besides.

Whatever might be the effect on the public mind in Milan of the marvels alleged to have witnessed in behalf of that faith, and of the prelate who "had defended it against heretics at the peril of his life," he had ere long the satisfaction of learning that a work of grace had been wrought on the African inquirer whose mental struggles he had anxiously watched, and whom he had treated with "true episcopal benignity,"—a work, indeed, the vast fruitfulness of which could not be appreciated, could not be so much as guessed at, by any one of that time. Augustine had found many of his Scripture difficulties vanish under a recent study of the great Apostolic convert: he had conferred with the venerable priest Simplicianus, who had told him the apposite story, so beautiful and inspiring, of the famous rhetoric-professor Victorinus, who in advanced years, and after cherishing Christian convictions in secret, had openly given in his name for baptism, and recited the Creed in full church, under the reign of the apostate Julian, sacrificing thereby, in virtue of Julian's vexatious law, his professorship and his brilliant position. Augustine's heart had "glowed" at the recital: his speculative difficulties were now mainly at an end, but "the two wills" were wrestling within him; he could not make up his mind to a life of Christian strictness, or enlist unreservedly "under the banner" of the Crucified. But then, just at the needful moment, came a visit from Pontitianus, who held some high place in Valentinian's court: he was struck by finding St. Paul's Epistles on Augustine's table, and, with a smiling glance at Augustine, led the conversation to the life of St. Antony, and told how two of his companions at Treves had found Athanasius's record of that life in a cell or cottage of monks. While Pontitianus spoke, Augustine felt himself, as he says, forced to look into himself, and utterly ashamed at the consciousness of his own thraldom under the lower nature. Pontitianus departed, little thinking of the effect which he had produced. Augustine and his friend Alypius went into the garden of the house which they were occupying; for a time they sat together, Augustine absorbed in a struggle for resolution to give himself thoroughly to God. The violent convulsive emotion drew forth a storm of tears; he rose and quitted his wondering friend, and threw himself down under a fig-tree, saying amid his sobs, "How long shall I say, 'To-

morrow, and to-morrow'? Why not now at once?" At once, from the next house, sounded in a kind of chant as from a child's voice, "Take up and read;" and Augustine, remembering how the casual hearing of a text from the Gospel had been the turning-point with Antony, returned to Alypius, took up the volume of St. Paul which they had taken with them into the garden, and opening it at hazard, lighted on the text, "Not in rioting," etc. (Rom. xiii. 13, 14), which, as we may well bear in mind, concludes our Epistle for Advent Sunday. "No farther did I choose to read, nor needed I." All darkness, all inward conflict, were at an end; he marked the passage in order to know it again, closed the volume, and turned on Alypius a look of calm happiness. The two friends, united in a common purpose, went into the house to tell Monnica, who, mindful of the words spoken to her by a bishop years before, and already quoted, "exulted and triumphed, and praised God, who could do more than men could ask or think."

It was within three weeks of the Vintage-vacation of Milanese scholars—towards the end of August, 386—and Augustine (who explained his resignation of his professorship by urging that he had felt during the summer a weakness of lungs and a pain in the chest) continued to lecture until the end of the term, to avoid all semblance of ostentation, and then retired. His friend Verecundus, a citizen and grammar-teacher of Milan, but not as yet a Christian, lent him his country-house at Cassisiacum, whither he repaired with his mother, his son Adeodatus—a lad of remarkable promise,—his brother Navigius, two of his cousins, his friend Alypius, and his pupils Trygetius and Licentius, the latter being the son of Augustine's old patron Romanianus. He found this "green retreat" a place of rest "from the fevers of the world," and afterwards expressed his confidence that its kindly owner would be rewarded with the "eternal freshness" of the paradise of God. He wrote to Ambrose to inform him of what had happened, and to ask his counsel. Ambrose advised him to read Isaiah; but he found great difficulties in the first part of the prophecy, and laid it aside, devoting most of his time to the composition of books "Against the Academics," "On a Happy Life" (which recorded a conversation held on his birthday, November 13, while he and his friends were seated at midday in the baths), also on "Order," and two books of "Soliloquies." For they discussed all manner of subjects, philosophical as well as religious, the scepticism of the New Academy, the nature of happiness, the indications of a plan

in nature, and the anomalies which seemed to exclude it. We find them walking out on a fine morning, until Monnica "pushes them in to breakfast." The young poet Licentius (who in after-years was but an unsteady Christian) reads Virgil to the party before supper, leaves his meal to compose verses, and sometimes, with Trygetius ("a little man but a great eater"), incurs a gentle reproof for want of seriousness. "If," says Augustine, "you like to call me your master, pay me my fee by being good fellows."

The winter passed away pleasantly, and the group of friends left Cassisiacum at the beginning of the Lent of 387; then Augustine, Alypius, and Adeodatus gave in their names at Milan as postulants for baptism. Augustine wrote or planned some other tracts, all bearing upon the subjects of the professorship which he had resigned; and the baptism to which he had so earnestly looked forward was administered by Ambrose on Easter-eve, which fell that year as late as April 24. After all the rites had been performed — the touching of the ears, the renunciations pronounced with face westward, the adhesion to Christ promised with face eastward, the benediction of the font, the lessons beginning with the Creation and ending with the miracle of Bethesda, the triple confession of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, followed severally by an immersion, the unction on the head, the washing of the feet, the white garments, the Confirmation, described as the reception of the "seal" of the Spirit, the approach to the duly-arrayed altar, and the first Communion—the great convert was, as he himself says, at once set free from "anxiety as to the sins of his past life;" it doubtless lay mapped out before him with its enigmas explained by his new faith. He saw how he had been led on, step after step, in the long and repeatedly interrupted process whereby the coil of sin and moral weakness was unwound, and the series of far-reaching, discriminating providences consummated in the quiet Milanese garden by the final grace of a victorious resolution. It was an experience truly unique, over which, we may well believe, that vivid forceful mind ranged in retrospect, and then rested in the assurance of forgiveness and the hope of a sustaining guidance to the end. After this memorable Easter, he and his friends spent some time in a common abode, and then proceeded to Ostia in order to sail for Africa. But Monnica was expecting her own speedy departure, now that her one motive for desiring to live longer was removed by her son's conversion. Augustine relates how he and his mother talked alone one day,

as they leaned out of a window that looked into the garden of the house at Ostia, about the nature of eternal happiness, conceiving of it as a communion with the "Very Self" of God, all transient media of His revelations being superseded by an intimate spiritual Presence. Five days after, or thereabouts, she was smitten with fever, and died in her fifty-sixth year, and her son's thirty-third. He, for some reason now unknown, returned from Ostia to Rome, and did not arrive in Africa until the autumn of 388.

It was after his baptism that Ambrose, now again taken into confidence by the court of Milan, consented to go on a second embassy to Maximus, in order to ask for the body of the murdered Gratian, and to obtain the settlement of a lasting peace. He was not, as he says, at all easy as to the safety of the throne of Valentinian; and he could not but long to give his brother an honoured grave. After arriving at Treves, Ambrose went the next day to the palace, entering doubtless the same room where Martin, the year before, had promised, in his distress about the sentence recorded against his own clients, to communicate with the persecutors of Priscillian. The chamberlain, a Gaul, came to receive him, and told him that he could only be heard in the Consistory. Ambrose demurred, but at last consented. Maximus, on his entrance, rose up, expecting the kiss of peace; but Ambrose stood stiffly among the "Consistorians," and made some remarks on the unseemliness of not granting him a private audience. The Emperor made a surly answer, and taxed Ambrose with having, on the former occasion, cajoled him so as to prevent him from invading Italy. Ambrose, after denying this charge at great length, asked to have Gratian's corpse given up for burial. Maximus evaded the request on political grounds: "the sight of Gratian's corpse would renew the feeling of his troops in his favour." Emperor and bishop parted for a time, Maximus promising to consider what he could do. But the "Ithacian" bishops were still at Treves. Ambrose felt with Martin as to their conduct, and would not, he says, communicate with bishops who "communicated with Maximus," the slayer of Gratian, or "who persecuted to death some persons, erring though they were from the faith"—a disapproval of such proceedings which he again expresses, when he censures those prelates who had accused men guilty of heinous crimes before the public tribunals, or had pressed their case to the extremities of capital punishment, or had approved such kind of accusations and "bloody triumphs of bishops." The party could not, of course,

refrain from avenging themselves on the archbishop of Milan for thus condemning their deed. They procured from Maximus a peremptory command that Ambrose should leave Treves without delay. He obeyed willingly, save that his tender heart was moved by the sad condition of a poor old bishop named Hyginus, who for some reason was being "led into exile, when he seemed all but at his last gasp." When Ambrose went to ask the Counts of the palace "not to let the old man be thrust out without a cloak and a down-pillow," he was "thrust out himself." His unsuccessful embassy was followed by another attempt, on Valentinian's part, to conciliate Maximus, who beguiled the credulous envoy Domninus, and after dismissing him made a rapid descent into Italy. Valentinian and Justina fled, in September, 387, to seek protection from Theodosius, who, though he took occasion to admonish them as to the consequences of oppressing the Catholic Church, received them with all kindness in his dominions and fixed their abode at Thessalonica.

CHAPTER XXV.

ST. AMBROSE AND THEODOSIUS.

THEODOSIUS had inherited the task of terminating that Gothic war which had proved the destruction of Valens. He never, says Gibbon, "revenged the battle of Hadrianople by any signal or decisive victory;" but by a gradual process, "the work of prudence rather than of valour," yet eminently statesmanlike and vigorous, he restored the confidence of the Roman troops, and "governed, by dividing," the forces of the barbarian foe. The Gothic king Athanaric—who in 372 had flung St. Sabas into the waters of a Wallachian stream for refusing to taste idol-meats—was induced to treat with Theodosius, and died while visiting Constantinople in January, 381: his words of admiration at the splendour of the city —"Doubtless the Emperor is a god upon earth"—might seem to be translated into action when the whole Visigoth host "enlisted under the standard of the empire." This happened in 382: a great body of Ostrogoths, invading the empire in 386, were compelled to ask for favourable terms; and numbers of both tribes were settled in Thrace and Asia Minor, while Gothic soldiers were maintained, as "allied troops," for the defence of the Eastern throne. But these arrangements were costly, and fresh taxation was the inevitable result. We know how bitter was the lot of Roman provincials under this burden; how oppressive the responsibilities, in regard to the collection of public taxes, which weighed on the unfortunate "curiales" who had to administer the affairs of their towns. The word "concussio," of which St. Luke gives us a Greek rendering, had a terribly distinct meaning for those who might be scared by a taxgatherer into exorbitant payments; and even the legal demands were often beyond the power of the inhabitants to meet, except with the consequence of exhausting the resources of a district, or even of reducing its fair fields to desolation.

Antioch, "the Queen of the Orient," with a population estimated about this period at two hundred thousand, was called upon to make an extraordinary subsidy: the requisition—as Libanius puts it tersely, "there came the letters about gold"—was a signal for sullen displeasure, which gave tokens of a fiercer mood to follow. It was the 26th of February, 387. Men said to each other, "Our life is not worth having: the city will be ruined." A concourse of angry men gathered in the streets. Every moment added to its menacing aspect; the hall of justice was invaded, and stones were flung at the pictures of the imperial family which were placed above the tribunal. Their statues of bronze were next attacked; the equestrian figure of the Emperor's ill-fated father, the likeness of his deceased wife Flaccilla—a model of piety, tender charity, and humility upon a throne—and his own imperial image, were struck at, thrown to the ground, or dragged about the streets. It was, said Libanius, "the act of a city gone mad;" and although he tried to throw the whole blame on a few wild youths, he afterwards spoke as if it had a more serious origin. The riot was soon suppressed; but what would be its penalty? Couriers were sent on the same day to inform the Emperor. The maxim which was cited about the same time by Ambrose, "Whosoever contemns the Emperor's statue is deemed to have injured the Emperor himself," was too likely to be carried out in some act of signal relentless vengeance by a monarch who, with all his virtues, had, as Ambrose expresses it, a natural impetuosity which could easily be kindled into a fiery wrath, and then was with difficulty brought under.

Libanius's description of the manifold charms of Antioch enables us to realise the distress of the inhabitants. The stateliness of the colonnades which lined the principal street, extending for four miles between the "cities" of Seleucus I. and of Antiochus Epiphanes (both distinct from the insular "new city" of Seleucus II. and Antiochus the Great), the sparkling and plashing of the fountains which were a special delight to the inhabitants, the magnificence of such public buildings as the basilica of Cæsar, the towering triple-roofed mansions of the rich, the appliances of luxury as well as of business which abounded alike in the city itself and in the suburb named after Agrippa, the gardens which spread beauty and fragrance along the banks of the Orontes,—Christians would add, the glittering splendour of the Golden Church,—these fair and familiar sights would but intensify

by contrast the anxiety, soon deepening into terror, which took possession of the volatile and wayward population. Many fled from their homes; others shut themselves up within doors; free and slave alike sat in gloomy seclusion, wondering how far the imperial punishment would extend, and listening as if for a thunder-clap, or trembling as at an earthquake. The questions of each day were, "Who has been arrested?" "Will Antioch itself be burned, and its very site ploughed up?" The magistrates had begun to take some penal notice of the outrage, perhaps hoping that by doing something they might prevent much. Would any potent voice be raised to plead for mercy? Bishop Flavian offered to do his best. He may have gained the see by a breach of faith, but he had greatly endeared himself to his flock: as Chrysostom, whom he had ordained priest the year before, expressed it, he seemed like Meletius risen from the dead. His generous hospitality to strangers exiled for their faith, his ripeness of mind and moderation even in self-discipline, his pastoral love, his persuasive preaching, the pleasure and refreshment caused by the mere sight of that "fatherly countenance" and that shining white hair, as he ascended to his throne in the Cathedral and blessed the congregation with the accustomed prayer for peace,—all this Chrysostom pictures with a fervent and loyal affection which, in its estimate of the bishop's character, took account of all his previous exertion and endurance in the cause of religion, and of his resistance, in yet earlier life, to the temptations of a noble and wealthy home. His age was now far advanced; but he did not hesitate (although he had a sister apparently dying) to undertake a journey to Constantinople in order to plead for the clemency of Theodosius to the city which he loved. He set out a few days after the sedition and shortly before Lent; on his way, he met Hellebichus and Cæsarius, sent to inquire into the facts, and armed with powers to chastise the guilty. In his absence, Chrysostom, now forty years old and the leading presbyter of the city, delivered a series of discourses "To the People of Antioch"—popularly known as "On the Statues"—intended to console them in their distress and fear, and also to reprove them for their prevalent vices: the fourth of these sermons was preached on the first day of Lent. He denounced the sin of "vain and rash" swearing, sometimes on the altar and by the holy Gospels, about the most trivial matters ("that one will beat another, that a slave shall be flogged, that the apprentice shall not eat until his task is done"), and the habit of bitter abuse

and detraction which was traditional in a population notorious for its jibing sarcastic humour. Other faults were adverted to, and all pains taken to turn this affliction to moral and religious advantage. The people crowded to church, deserting the forum; there was a great increase of devotion, and of watchfulness against various forms of sin.

The two imperial commissioners arrived in the first week of Lent. One held the rank of Master-General of the Army; the other was Master of the Offices, or chief magistrate of the palace. They were both estimable men; but they were charged with a hard task, a mission of great severity. When they entered the forum, there were but two or three persons to be seen walking across it, so great was the terror inspired by their arrival; the lively stir of traffic, the mirth of weddings and private parties, the lectures and studies in the public schools, were suspended by the general calamity; the "metropolis of Asia," which could be traversed only in a long walk, seemed death-stricken. The first step taken by the commissioners was to disfranchise the city, and to close the various public baths, with the hippodrome and the theatre. Then came a rigorous inquiry, with closed and guarded doors, as to the authors of the sedition; and the unhappy mothers or sisters of the accused, crouching on the pavement outside, were tortured by hearing stern voices of menace, then the clash of the scourge, and the cries of pain from sufferers whose evidence was thus cruelly extorted and might be fatal to a brother or a son. Chrysostom, gazing at this misery, was led to think—in anticipation, one may say, of a stanza of the *Dies Iræ*—"If now no relative, however innocent, can rescue the prisoner from a human tribunal, who will stand by us when we are arraigned before the judgment-seat of Christ?" Evening came, and forth from the hall of justice issued, in chains, men who had held high office and exhibited public shows, now condemned at least to imprisonment, while in some cases capital punishment was inflicted. But next day, when rich and influential friends dared not speak for the prisoners, when pagan philosophers who had bragged of their contempt for worldly interests were hiding in caves outside the city, the monks of the hill-country flocked into Antioch, and showed what could be done at such a crisis by generous and resolute men. It is the one case of monastic interference in civil affairs which can be recorded with simple approval. They forced their way, by the sanctity of their class-character, into the commissioners'

presence, and protested that they would not depart until either the city were spared or they themselves sent with the prisoners to Constantinople. "Our sovereign is a religious man; we shall be sure to propitiate him." One hermit named Macedonius, who had no learning whatever, and did nothing but pray on a mountain-top, is said by Theodoret to have met the two commissioners in the city, and bidden them to dismount, adding (after they had done so, out of respect for his holy life) that they should go and tell the Emperor that a lifeless image might be replaced, but God's image in man, if destroyed, was past recovery. But this is probably an amplified version of a remonstrance uttered within the court. The commissioners promised that if the monks would let their request be taken down, they themselves would return to the court and intercede with the Emperor; this bargain was made and carried out, Cæsarius returning to Theodosius while Hellebichus remained at Antioch.

Meantime Flavian had had his interview with the Emperor at Constantinople; had heard his complaint about the Antiochenes' ungrateful insolence as extending even to "the dead who had never done them any wrong;" had reminded him of his own noble wish that at Easter he could raise dead men to life; had finally prevailed by reminding him of the condition attached by the Lord of all to *His* forgiveness, and exhorting him to secure mercy by first showing it. Theodosius, it is said, himself alluded to the prayer of Christ for His crucifiers, and then bade Flavian hasten home with the assurance of pardon. Flavian sent onwards messengers bearing the Emperor's grant, which reached Antioch between April 16 and April 25, or Easter Day. Never had the "Day of Splendour" been observed in the "Christian" city with more rapturous delight; and Flavian had the special relief of finding his sister alive, while Chrysostom characteristically concluded his "Homilies on the Statues" by narrating Flavian's mission and its result, and by bidding his hearers thank God "not only for delivering them from this trouble, but for allowing it to come to pass." This thought of divine mercy overruling all for good went with "the Golden-mouthed" to the end of his life, and was one secret of his power. It is curious to find Libanius assuring Theodosius that those who cannot pay tribute will gratefully invoke Ares and Athena in his behalf, and that "prayer from many lips is sure to avail."

After some hesitation, and, according to the unfriendly Zosimus,

with the prospect of obtaining the hand of Galla, the sister of Valentinian, Theodosius resolved on attacking Maximus, whom he defeated and pursued to Aquileia, where the "prostrate" usurper was put to death, in July or August, 388. This event was followed by a somewhat lengthy sojourn of Theodosius in the West. He came to Milan immediately after his victory: and while staying there he was persuaded by the importunate and peremptory remonstrances of Ambrose—first in writing, then in personal conference—to revoke an order for the rebuilding, at the expense of the bishop of Callinicus in Osrhoene, of a Jewish synagogue, burnt, it was said, at his instigation, and for the punishment of certain monks who had been provoked by an interruption of their procession into burning a rudely built "Valentinian" village chapel. It must be owned that Ambrose threw into this business an amount of passionate zeal which would have been better spent upon a matter of spiritual life and death. He writes in a tone which approaches, considering the subject, to fanaticism. Although an ex-governor, he does not enter into the point of view of a magistrate interested in the upholding of social order, and divinely authorised as "a minister of God." He intimates that if the bishop of Callinicus were to refuse obedience, and suffer death for refusal, he would be a martyr (which is certainly a serious misappropriation of that sacred name); and, on the other hand, that obedience to the order would be equivalent to betrayal of faith. He justifies such an action as the destruction, by individual zeal, of a place where Christ was denied. He will assume for himself the full responsibility. He protests against the rebuilding of the synagogue under any circumstances, or at any one's cost—in the case that, not the bishop, but other Christians are frightened into rebuilding it. Public order or "discipline" must yield to religious interests (it being simply assumed that religious interests forbade the rebuilding). He refers to other cases in which arson had not been punished; he assumes that the attempt of Julian to rebuild the Temple is a parallel case; and argues, with strange short-sightedness, from the culpable indifference of Julian's government as to the wrongs endured by Christians in his time. As for the Valentinian place of worship, he treats it as no better than a pagan temple. He pronounces with perfect confidence that Maximus's order in 387 for the rebuilding of a synagogue burnt at Rome was divinely avenged by a judicial infatuation which delivered him into the hands of his conqueror. He protests that a triumph given to Jews

would be hailed by them as a new Exodus. He does not shrink from telling Theodosius what Christ will say to him if he carries out his order; he is positive that he will be hazarding his faith and risking his salvation for the sake of Jews. Then, as if conscious that Theodosius might not be swayed by his personal unsupported influence, he asks that other bishops may be consulted; and intimates that the hierarchy is already discontented at the existing limitation of clerical immunity from "curial" burdens—*i.e.* at the requirement that "curiales" who wished to become clerics must first give up their property. This letter not being successful (at which one cannot marvel), Ambrose "preached at" Theodosius in one of the Milanese churches, when the Emperor came thither for service. After a very tedious, verbose prologue, full of strange "conceits," he abandoned the high tone of his letter, and simply begged the Emperor to pardon the offence of the monks for the sake of Him whose servants they were. Then, when he came down from the pulpit, Theodosius gently, almost playfully, observed, "You have been preaching about me;" and added that he had recalled the order for the restoration of the burnt synagogue, but that the monks were really in the habit of committing many offences—"many wicked acts" (*scelera*) in Ambrose's report of his language. After Timasius, master of the soldiery, had tried to put in a word here against the monks, Ambrose rebuked him, then stood still for a few moments, then said, "Set my mind at ease—let me offer for you without anxiety." Theodosius, who was seated, made some sign of assent. Ambrose still remained motionless. "Well," said the Emperor, "I will amend the rescript." "Cancel the whole proceeding." "Well, I will." "Now I trust you, I trust you." "Yes, trust me." Then, and not till then, the pertinacious bishop proceeded with the service. By sheer importunity he had prevailed; but the whole affair is not among the most honourable acts of his life, and indicates too much of unbalanced zeal impairing his sense of the claims of justice and social order, or, in modern phrase, too much of an untempered "ecclesiasticism." It was about this time, apparently, that he also gave notice to the Emperor that he must not stand within the sanctuary, after having brought his offering for the altar. At Constantinople he was wont to stand there; but at Milan Ambrose forbade it, and assigned him a special place, nearest to the chancel screen. Theodosius afterwards said that Ambrose alone had thus taught him "the difference between an emperor and a bishop."

Ambrose had also again to withstand the efforts of the pagan senators in behalf of their "altar of Victory." It was their third application that was made to Theodosius in the close of 388. He was disappointed, at first, by finding the Emperor not very responsive to his arguments. He therefore kept aloof from him for several days; but Theodosius did, in fact, repulse Symmachus with great decision. The pagan hopes were again blighted, and were more than ever crushed by the result of the Emperor's visit to the capital in the June of 389.

The presence of Theodosius at Rome naturally assisted the influx of converts into the Church with which he was in communion. Yet Siricius was not without anxieties, in spite of such additions to his flock. The Roman Luciferians, Marcellinus and Faustinus, had by their memorial, some four years earlier, persuaded Theodosius that the Spanish bishop Gregory, and the Egyptian bishop Heraclidas, representatives of their sect, had been deeply wronged, and ought to be respected as Catholic confessors: but Claudian, the Donatist bishop, had been banished by Gratian; and Leontius, the Novatian, who was held in esteem, says Socrates, by the Emperor, was not perhaps very obnoxious to the Church. There was, however, a more alarming peril, a more distressing scandal, in the strength of the Manichean body at Rome.

We must here pause to observe that Manicheism is one of the most extraordinary phenomena in "the history of human error." Its wonderful force, versatility, and vitality are evidenced by its holding sway for some years over such a mind as Augustine's, by its active self-propagation not only in the East, but in such a region as North Africa, and by its reappearance in the Paulicianism of the seventh century and the Albigensianism of the twelfth. This may be confidently said about it—that it was not properly a heresy, an erroneous superstructure on an Evangelical basis, but rather that the New Testament phrases and ideas which it appropriated and utilised were simply the decoration of a system radically heathenish, which Augustine tersely characterizes as "a most false and most fallacious Persian fable." Thus it could present to unwary Christians a certain amount of religious attractiveness, while, in fact, it was contributing a vast force to the manifold elements of Antichristian reaction; it was, in truth, not so much a religion as a physical theory of the universe, with appropriate deductions for the regulation of human life. It appealed to minds of very various types; it spoke in familiar language to those who cherished

Docetic, Gnostic, Emanatist notions; it offered a solution, on strictly Dualistic principles, of the mystery of the origin of evil—a solution which should supersede faith, and therefore dethrone ecclesiastical authority by enriching mankind with rational certainties and knowledge complete at every turn. Thus it contrived to gratify, at once, the mystical and the rationalising tempers; it fed human self-importance by a pantheistic account of the relations between God and the soul; it relieved the conscience from a sense of responsibility; it provided the imagination with a gorgeous and complex symbolism; it sanctioned the deep-seated Oriental feeling as to the essential evil of matter; it professed to enshrine the "spiritual" truth which popular Christianity, as it affirmed, had overlaid with a mass of Judaism; it called Christians the "simple folk," as Gnosticism had called them the "psychical" or unspiritual; it encouraged an extremely "free handling" of the Christian Scriptures, while it denounced as immoral and degrading the severities and the "economic" language of the Old Testament; it held up a standard of strict purity, "a seal set on mouth, on hands, on bosom;" it had its own teaching, its own exhortations, as to the combat between Light and Darkness, which every good man, by the help of his better soul, was to take his part in maintaining; it had a ritual of rigorous "simplicity," a hierarchy of five or six degrees, but without "sacerdotalism;" and instead of the Catholic scheme of catechumens and faithful, it had the two great classes of the ascetic "Elect" and the "Auditors" bound by a milder rule. And an intelligent Roman, for instance, who took his place among the Auditors, with a view of ultimately becoming an Elect, would be instructed out of such books as the "Epistle of Manes" and the "Treasure;" he would learn to think of Manes as the true Paraclete, the reformer and truest exponent of Christianity, who had completed the work which the Apostles began. When he became an Elect, he would receive the full esoteric teaching. "Light and Darkness," it would be said to him, "are in eternal antithesis; and they form two irreconcilable powers. Over the kingdom of Light reigns from all eternity, in His majesty and sanctity, the all-good 'Father,' with a multitude of æons sharing His essence; in contrast to this Light-kingdom lies the co-eternal kingdom of Darkness, the world of matter, and therefore of evil, with its regions of earthy gloom, of turbid waters, of wild winds, of fire, and of smoke, in which last the Prince of evil dwells. To guard His frontier against the evil kingdom, the Father sent down

an æon, the 'Mother of life.' She made the 'First Man,' who fought with the dark powers; they absorbed into themselves part of his essence; that part, thus imprisoned in the bondage of Matter, was 'Jesus Patibilis:' the rest of the First Man, restored by the 'Living Spirit' to the Light-kingdom, dwelt, as a pure, unsullied being, in the sun. Here, then, see the turning-point of the world's history! The Evil One desired to retain in bondage the particles of light; the Father desired to deliver and regain them. The evil powers combined to give up to their chief all these particles of heavenly Essence: he formed them into Adam, who thus became a compound of good and evil, of spirit and matter. The Father commanded His living Spirit to form an earth for Adam; the dark powers tried to baffle His purpose, by forbidding Adam to taste of the tree of knowledge; but the pure Being dwelling in the sun persuaded him to do so, and thus to apprehend his position. The dark powers were more successful in causing Adam to become the parent of a race, and thus to perpetuate the thraldom of the 'Jesus Patibilis,' till at length the pure counterpart of this 'Jesus' came on earth in a phantom-body, conciliating Jewish prejudices by calling Himself 'Christ,' representing in a mere unreal semblance of anguish and death the long sufferings of the imprisoned Light-essence, and illuminating the ignorance of blinded souls, in preparation for the full light which was to beam forth in our great Master. See, then, this central fact in all mundane events, the persistent effort of the particles of light to break their bonds: it is the duty of all who would ultimately belong to light, in the fullest sense of the phrase, to facilitate this effort in every case; the Elect must hold even vegetable life divine and sacred, and the Auditors must bring herbs and fruits (never to a hungry man as such, but) to the Elect, who, by eating them, will liberate those particles which they contain. And you must strive to overcome the evil soul, which you inherit from Adam as formed by the Prince of Darkness, and by progressive purgation to live wholly in and by the good soul, the Light-essence; this purgation will continue after death, but the end is absorption into glory."

The proselyte who heard this teaching would find himself in the midst of an organized body of persons possessed, in great measure, by an enthusiasm for propagating it, but also aware of the great need of caution in doing so. He would, perhaps, be encouraged, if he had been Christian, to keep up appearances of Christian or Church membership, short of receiving the Eucharistic

chalice; to visit St. Peter's for the early celebration, but in ascending to its portals (at the east end) to turn round and bow to the rising sun, the symbol of the Manichean Christ. This, at least, was the habit of the Roman Manicheans in the fifth century. Within the penetralia of the Manichean brotherhood, the proselyte would be required to fast on Sundays; he would observe that the Christian Easter was hardly noticed, and would learn that, the Nativity, Passion, Resurrection of "Christ" being simply impressions produced, not facts or events, it was inconsistent with enlightened convictions to celebrate them with vigil, or festival, or fast, as did the "Judaical half-Christians." But there *was* a solemnity worth observing, the anniversary of that "real Passion," the cruel martyrdom of Manes under the king of Persia. On that day, in March, the Manichean community assembled in front of a "tribunal" or pulpit (hence the feast was called "Bema"), with five steps leading up to it, and precious cloths spread over it; and before it all the votaries of Manes bowed down in reverent homage.

The moral and social state of the society, a few years before, had not been in a good condition, as far as Rome was concerned; and the efforts of an Auditor named Constantius to improve it by introducing a community-life among the Elect, were frustrated by the indifference or hostility of their "bishops," and by the ungovernable wilfulness of the Elect themselves. Theodosius, on this occasion of his visiting Rome, was at once, it seems, importuned by pope Siricius to do something against the Manicheans. Four days had not elapsed since his arrival when he put forth a brief edict, expelling the Manicheans from Rome, and depriving them (as he had done before in the East, by a law of 382) of the power of bequeathing property by will.

Another trouble that beset the Roman Church at this time was caused by the teaching of Jovinian, formerly an ascetic, who, in Jerome's coarse language, *used* to walk "barefoot with rough coat and black shirt, with a pale face and a hand horny through toil;" but who had left his cell, put on a white dress, and begun to disseminate opinions very unpleasing to the rulers and representative men of the Church. These opinions were: (1) That virgins, widows, and married persons, if baptized, and equally earnest in conduct, had the same merit and should be held in the same honour. (2) That abstinence from meats was not better than partaking of them with thanksgiving. (3) That those who "with full faith" had been born again in baptism could not be

overthrown by the devil, and that baptized persons who had fallen under a temptation were *ipso facto* "proved to have been baptized with water only, not with the Spirit." (4) That all who had "kept their baptism" would have the same reward in the kingdom of heaven; and to this, apparently, was added a parallel statement as to the precise equality of the condition of all the lost. Of these the third is particularly interesting, for it proceeded on that same interpretation of certain words in St. John's First Epistle (*e.g.* iii. 9) which in modern times has been cited for the indefectibility of grace; and was, of course, to be met by the balancing consideration of other passages, which imply the possibility of its forfeiture, and assert, in fact, that the regenerate can become the fallen. Beside this point, there is the quasi-Stoical conception of the strict equality between virtues or vices, which, proceeding on a line of hard logic, declines to recognise facts of character. It is to be noted that Jovinian, in more than one case, appears to have thought that his opinions were the needful protest against a Manichean tendency; and thus his line as a speculator illustrates the formidable spread of that erroneous system, as well as the over-statements in regard to fasting and celibacy against which he felt stirred up to contend.

"A memorial of an alarming kind" was presented to Siricius against the tenets of Jovinian; he assembled his presbytery —the deacons and other clerics being present—and they unanimously advised the excommunication of Jovinian with eight others. This sentence was pronounced by Siricius, and communicated to the Church of Milan, because Jovinian had repaired thither. In this document the pope is careful not to seem to disparage matrimony, for, he says, "we assist at weddings by blessing the nuptial veil;" he only insists that in the New Testament a virgin life, when undertaken from devotional motives, is honoured above a married life. The bishops of Northern Italy appear to have assembled about the close of 389 or the beginning of 390; and Ambrose wrote in their name to Siricius, cordially applauding his vigorous action in the matter. Assuredly the bishops of Rome and Milan vied with each other in vehemence against "the adversary of modesty, the teacher of licentiousness," "the howling beast, who would confound all distinctions of desert," the "dogs that barked against the mysteries of the Church," the voluptuaries who "regretted that they ever reduced themselves by fasting." It was not characteristic of Siricius, or even of Ambrose, to appreciate the point of

view of an opponent who came across the line of cherished feelings; to distinguish between what in his mind and opinions was false or extravagant, and what was the expression of, or the effort to express, a sound idea. For us it is a duty to say that Jovinian had got hold of one or two great truths, and did not know how to manage and apply them. He was justly afraid of a mechanical religiousness, of artificial classifications which might lower the moral aim, of the revival of a corrupt and unspiritual asceticism; and in his impetuosity he not only ignored the reality of special calls to exceptional self-devotion, but was swept on by his logic to conclude that the one salvation could not possibly co-exist with degrees of blessedness; to dwell exclusively on such texts as that of the single "denarius" in the parable; to explain away the received sense of the "many mansions," and of the words "if thou wilt be perfect;" and to infer that "once regenerate" was "always regenerate," and therefore that to fall into deadly sin was to prove oneself not to have been regenerated, but to have received baptism ineffectively. There is the haste, the onesidedness, the readiness to embrace extremes, which mark the fanatic—there is not the considerateness and moderation of a thoughtful divine—about this writer, who has been called "the Protestant of his age." But he was not, as far as we can see, dealt with as the Church should have treated such a mind. Its confusions, its assumptions, its inconclusive ways of reasoning, were not quietly pointed out; the superficial view of the relation of grace to free will—the love of short cuts, so to speak, and rough-and-ready decisions—the reactionary passion which virtually makes abuse condemn use, might have been, should have been, corrected "in a spirit of meekness;" but the onslaught on celibacy and fasting, even more than the momentous inference about "a baptism not of the Spirit," provoked the high ecclesiastics of Italy beyond patience, and Jovinian was treated as a pestilent blasphemer.

The same prelates who subscribed the letter in reply to Siricius were apparently reassembled in the spring of 390, on account of the arrival at Milan of some bishops from Gaul, who were most probably bearers of a communication from their brethren respecting the case of Ithacius—a fact which Duchesne mentions as illustrating the general Western disposition to "consider the bishop of Milan as an authority of the first rank." Ithacius had been excommunicated and sent into exile; and Felix, bishop of Treves, who had been appointed by his party, was regarded as,

like him, deserving of the censure of the Church. As far as we can make out, Ambrose approved the excommunication of Ithacius; and both he and Siricius wrote letters, disclaiming all fellowship with Felix. But while the North-Italian Church was occupied with these measures against persons who were implicated in the "Ithacian" policy—particularly against Ithacius himself—and was thus condemning the cruelty of which the Priscillianists had been the victims, tidings came from across the Hadriatic which concentrated public attention and grief on a more wholesale and more appalling case of cruelty, which, together with the events which followed it, has left a most conspicuous mark on the history of the time. Those who know little else about that history, and about the life and character of the great Saint of Milan, have at any rate heard something of the penance of Theodosius.

The Emperor had returned from Rome to Milan shortly before Jovinian, condemned at Rome, had endeavoured to make his position good in Northern Italy. He doubtless sanctioned, or approved, the severe line taken at Milan respecting that innovator; and he continued to make Milan his residence, and to live on terms of entire confidence with Ambrose. It was in April, 390, that he heard of a disgraceful outrage perpetrated at Thessalonica: the mob, disappointed at the imprisonment, for a heinous crime, of a charioteer who was to have contributed to their amusement at some races in their hippodrome, rose up against Botheric, the commander of the forces, who had firmly refused to release the offender, and who now paid for his righteous strictness by being murdered in the insurrection. Other officials were similarly slain; and the Emperor, justly incensed, had meditated a general vengeance on the whole city of Thessalonica. Such a purpose illustrates the long survival of that "defective sense of individuality" which, as Mozley has shown at length, suggested the inclusion of a criminal's family and dependants, near or remote, in a sentence which he himself had incurred—as if only in this way could justice "get the whole of him." Ambrose and other bishops interposed, and, as Augustine tells us, obtained from Theodosius a promise to spare the city. But certain counts of his court, and especially his "odious favourite" Rufinus, whose function as Master of the Offices has been compared to that of a state-secretary for all departments at once, represented to him what in their view was the weakness of being swayed by priests into a lenity which could but encourage

rebellion. This counsel conspired with the strain of ferocity under provocation which marred the Emperor's nobleness, and also with his indolent reliance on trusted advisers, to defeat his "second thoughts;" and orders were issued for a general slaughter of the Thessalonian people, which Rufinus, of course, would describe as the execution of a community responsible, as such, for the murder of an imperial officer. Such deeds, as we have seen, would not have shocked the conscience of primitive times; but how, one asks, could a Christian prince think them lawful? Cæsarism, by concentrating all judicial power in the Cæsar, made them possible; and the possibility might arouse "the wild beast in the man," as it did oftener, though to less tragical effect, in Valentinian I. We are told that Theodosius again returned to a better mind, and sent off a mandate, which came too late, recalling his sanguinary order. An indiscriminate massacre continued for three hours, and seven thousand persons perished without the slightest form of trial, including several strangers who had recently come up for commercial reasons to the great Macedonian capital, which now, in Sozomen's expression, was "deluged with innocent blood." By one account the people were attacked while assembled in the circus; but this detail may have been due to the agents employed, rather than to any imperial instructions. When the dreadful news reached Milan, Theodosius was absent; but he was soon to return, and Ambrose, taking advantage of an illness which, though real, would not in other circumstances have kept him out of his sovereign's presence, retired into the country, chiefly in order to give Theodosius time to reflect. He wrote with his own hand a letter of earnest remonstrance. After referring at the outset to the Emperor's long-standing friendliness, he dwelt on the fact that Theodosius had often been annoyed by his having heard of resolutions taken in the Consistory. But what he had heard, he could not help hearing: and could he now be silent? Quoting Ezekiel's words as to the duty of "warning" a sinner, he adverted to the fiery temper which was the besetting fault of the monarch, although he could often exhibit a generous clemency; he spoke of the "unparalleled deed" which had been done at Thessalonica, and of which the prelates then met in Milan had heard "with groans, not one of them viewing it indulgently;" and urged the Emperor to imitate the contrition which David showed on the two occasions on which *he* had been rebuked. "If you choose to attend the service, I dare not offer the sacrifice:" nor could Theodosius expect

to have any offering of his accepted. It was the part of a true Christian not to excuse, but to condemn, his own sin. He concluded with expressions of loyal and cordial regard.

Theodosius found this letter awaiting him on his return to Milan; at first he treated it with a strange indifference, and, relying on his imperial position, was coming to church as if nothing had happened. Ambrose, who had also returned, confronted him in the "atrium" outside the church—the entrance court now represented for visitors to Sant' Ambrogio by a spacious and stately enclosure attributed to a ninth-century archbishop—and, as Paulinus puts it briefly, "refused him permission to enter:" Sozomen adds that he publicly took hold of the Emperor's purple robe. Whatever might be the Emperor's surprise, his frank and noble nature mastered irritation, and although we can hardly suppose that he pleaded that David, after all, had done worse than he (indeed, it is highly probable that Paulinus made a confusion between the bishop's own reference to David's case and words spoken on this occasion by the Emperor), he submitted to the official announcement that he must do penance for a definite period. Eight months passed away, and Christmas came to gladden the faithful of Milan with the hymn in which their bishop invoked the "Redeemer of the nations, the Virgin-born, the Incarnate God, from whose manger-cradle beamed forth, to the eyes of faith, the ever-fresh brightness of a day that knew no close." The churches were crowded as usual with worshippers of every class. But one Christian and Churchman remained within his apartments as if not venturing to welcome the great Birthday. It was believed in the next century that Theodosius, who had laid aside, during those sad months, the imperial ornaments, was found by his evil counsellor Rufinus sitting alone and bathed in tears. The Greek historian's narrative is too rhetorical to be trustworthy in detail. Words are put into the Emperor's mouth which Theodoret considered proper for such exceptional circumstances; he is said to have accepted Rufinus's proposal to intercede with Ambrose—a proposal naturally ineffectual—and then, on receiving a discouraging message from the bishop while he was passing through the forum on his way to the basilica, to have obtained admission to the episcopal guest-chamber adjoining the church. There Ambrose, we are told, consented to readmit him to Church fellowship if he would do his best to prevent such consequences of imperial wrath by enacting that, in every case, an interval of thirty days should elapse between a capital sentence and

its execution. The Emperor then found himself free to enter the church. But his profound contrition was expressed by his humble demeanour; he did not stand, nor even kneel, but, in the attitude of the third class of the penitents, prostrated himself on the pavement, repeating, we are told, the words, "My soul cleaveth to the dust!" smiting his forehead and tearing his hair, and watering the ground with his tears. To this scene Ambrose alludes when he says that Theodosius, "having stripped off his insignia," publicly, in the church, wept for his sin, into which he had been betrayed by the deceitful influence of others. "With groans and tears he entreated pardon, nor was there a day of his after life on which he did not bewail that error."

Such was the memorable triumph, "the culminating point," as Milman calls it, "of pure Christian influence," when "Christianity appeared before the world as the champion and vindicator of outraged humanity." Theodosius, at this Christmas festival of 390, endured the "shame that is glory and grace," and called out, as Augustine tells us, the sympathy and admiration of his people by a humiliation which was, in truth, the ennobling of Christian monarchy, because it was not the mere assertion of ecclesiastical power over civil within the sphere of Church life (although it might afterwards be perverted into a precedent for ecclesiastical encroachments), but the recognition by the civil power, on genuinely Christian and moral grounds, of its subjection to an authority which knew no respect of persons, when enforcing as a condition of Christian privileges the necessity of repentance for a crime against humanity and against God.

CHAPTER XXVI.

THE LAST YEARS OF THEODOSIUS.

The state of the Eastern Church, at the time of the Penance of Theodosius, was not very satisfactory. For several years, in spite of the Councils of Constantinople, her different branches had been suffering, partly from the spread of heresy, partly from faction and division. Gregory Nazianzen had just died, after undergoing, since his retirement from Constantinople, a series of anxieties and distresses under which, at one time, his faith in the providential government of the Church well-nigh gave way. "It seems," he wrote to Nectarius, "as if the care of God, which in our fathers' times had always watched over the Churches, had now entirely abandoned the present life. My soul is so immersed in a depth of calamities, that I hardly reckon my own personal troubles —intolerable as they would otherwise seem—among evils, and look only at the general affliction of the Church." He describes the Arians—that is, those who were called Eudoxians—as audaciously assuming a right to organize Churches. The Macedonians boasted of having bishops ordained by their chief Eleusius. The Apollinarians, however, constituted, in his opinion, the most painful of all the Church's trials. They claimed the same liberty to assemble as that which belonged to Churchmen. Gregory had seen a book by Apollinaris, which exceeded every other specimen of heresy; it distinctly affirmed that the Lord Jesus, "the Second Man from Heaven," had brought His flesh with Him from above, and that He, the "Only-begotten God," the Lifegiver, the destroyer of death, had suffered death in His Divinity. Toleration of such teaching appeared to Gregory a virtual "condemnation of the doctrine of the Church."

Apollinaris himself died, probably before the year 390, at a very advanced age, retaining his heresy to the last, and leaving

behind him a multitude of writings, in verse as well as in prose. His followers were proud to bear his name, or that of his disciple, bishop Vitalis; but they were divided into two parties—the more extreme represented by Polemon and Timotheus, who maintained that the Divinity and the flesh of Christ were "consubstantiated" or formed into one nature; and the more moderate, led by Valentinus, who declared this notion to be alike untenable and impious. Among the sects which were most directly opposed to the Apollinarian, the Eudoxians kept up their episcopal succession by placing Marinus in the seat of Demophilus, and then superseding him by Dorotheus, whom they summoned from Antioch. Hence arose a schism and a controversy. Dorotheus maintained (logically from the Arian standpoint) that "God was not Father" before the "generation" of the Son, while Marinus and his adherents —who were nicknamed Psathyrians or "Cakemen," because one of their leaders was a cake-seller—held that He was "Father" even while the Son existed not; and Selenas, or Selinus, the successor of Ulfilas, a man of "bilingual" ability, professed this opinion. Moreover, in the little Psathyrian sect a quarrel arose between Marinus and Agapius, whom Marinus had ordained as bishop for Ephesus. The feud between the Psathyrians and the rest of the Eudoxians lasted thirty-five years. Of the Anomœans, also, a similar story has to be told: Eunomius had died at his native village in Cappadocia; and his disciple Theophronius, who, like him, was a keen dialectician and Aristotelian, and had written a book "On Training of the Mind," was cast off by the other Eunomians for asserting that the divine knowledge was of a different kind in regard to past, present, and future. Eutychius, another Eunomian, declared that the Son had received from the Father full knowledge of the time of the Last Judgment; he too, before Eunomius's death, had been driven out of the communion of the Eunomian bishops; but it is remarkable that his view was sanctioned by Eunomius, who admitted Eutychius to prayers, although he did not come fortified by letters of commendation. The Macedonians were distracted between the partisans of Carterius and Eutropius. The contagion, so to speak, of dissension reached even the tranquil Novatians, among whom Quartodecimanism had revived in the reign of Valens, and was again advocated by a Jewish convert named Sabbatius, who had been admitted to priest's orders; but the Novatian bishops, assembled in Council at a Bithynian town named Angarum or Sangarum, passed a canon which "left the

question open," allowing every one to follow whatever Paschal reckoning pleased him best—a settlement unsatisfactory to Sabbatius, whose pertinacity leads Socrates to make some very "liberal" remarks on the uselessness of rigorous attempts at uniformity in face of such varieties of observance as were to be found in different churches, and to argue from the Acts and Epistles that the apostles never imposed on their converts a "yoke" of ceremonial "servitude." Sabbatius afterwards seceded from the Novatian body on this Paschal question, inserted in his text of St. Luke—perhaps by way of gloss—a curse on "all who should keep Pasch outside the days of unleavened bread," and, in violation of a promise imposed upon him, accepted the episcopate among his own little set of partisans.

Other heresies of newer growth were becoming matters of anxiety. A sect of fanatics who called themselves Messalians or Euchites (as "men of prayer"), and also "Spiritual men," reduced all religious acts to the one act of prayer, which was with them a protracted contemplative ecstasy. They denied the efficacy of ordinances, and denounced manual labour "for meat that perisheth," as prohibited by the words of the Lord. They never fasted. They held that baptism did indeed, as it were "with a razor," cut off all former sins, but left the roots of sin to be extirpated, and the haunting presence of a fiend to be got rid of, by constant "prayer." They regarded the Holy Communion as "neither helpful nor hurtful." Their Quietism—to use a modern phrase—dispensing, as it thus did, with sacramental media of intercourse with God, and concentrating the whole attention on individual efforts after the realisation of His interior presence, naturally betrayed its votaries into the wildest mystical dreamings, as of a sensible perception of the Holy Trinity—such as the early enthusiam of Ignatius Loyola supposed itself to have enjoyed on the doorsteps of a church. And by stimulating to excess the self-consciousness of the soul, thus absorbed in its own solitary action, or rather inaction, Messalianism encouraged that contempt for all extraneous communities or sects which impelled, in so many cases (as in that of the Priscillianists), the sectarian mystic or heretic to conceal his convictions when questioned about them—even to deny, or on occasion to anathematize, what he inwardly held—on the principle that the profane world outside the pale was not worthy to know the truth and had no right to be answered ingenuously. They were condemned by the

Council of Side in Pamphylia in 383. It was very little to the credit of the aged Flavian that he lured an old Messalian from Edessa, named Adelphius, into a friendly conversation, and having thus obtained a frank statement, suddenly turned on his informant as self-convicted, and thereupon procured the expulsion of the Messalians from Syria.

The Churchmen of the East were also scandalized by the continued existence of two or three sects which in some respects suggest recollections of modern controversy. There were the followers of Helvidius, whom Epiphanius labels "Adversaries of Mary," and whom he attacks in an elaborate letter; there were in the opposite direction the Collyridians, so called because they, or more especially their women, exhibited "Marianism" in an extravagant form by spreading a linen cloth over a square seat, and offering a loaf or roll of coarse bread, called a *collyris*, "either *to* Mary or *for* her," said Epiphanius, who scornfully describes this sample of morbid feminine sentiment (which grew up in Thrace and Scythia) as "silly and devoid of reason," and adds emphatically, "Mary is to be honoured, but not to the point of worship; let the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit be worshipped; let no one worship Mary." The Audians were named after a Mesopotamian of austere virtue and intense zeal for discipline; worldly-mindedness and carelessness in bishops and priests had found in him an unsparing censor, and they had repaid his criticisms by a hostility which was too much for his patience. He persuaded himself that he had no longer any portion in the Church, and that he must needs secede from her communion; various followers joined him, and from one, a bishop, he obtained episcopal consecration. Strictness of conduct was a characteristic of the Audians; their monasteries among the Goths were models of religious discipline; but they were bitter against all Churchmen as such, and took up a crude literalism, like that of certain Egyptian monks, in regard to the anthropomorphic language of the Old Scriptures, and in their aversion to Catholic rites went back to a Judaical reckoning of Easter. When Epiphanius wrote, they were reduced to a few inhabitants in two villages beyond Damascus; but they kept up their succession, and probably gained some reinforcements, for Theodoret in the next century describes them as explaining their separation, like the Novatians, by the defect of discipline in the Church with regard to unlawful marriages and the taking of "usury." They are said to have observed strict secrecy in regard to their anthropomorphic ideas and to a strange

bit of Oriental fantasy as to the uncreatedness of light, fire, and darkness. They had a penitential system, and gave absolution to those who, having confessed their sins, passed between two rows of sacred books—perhaps an imitation of the rite alluded to in Jer. xxxiv. 18. The Aerians are chiefly known by their "presbyterianism." Aerius, at first the friend, then the bitter enemy, of that Eustathius of Sebaste who became the tormentor of Basil's episcopal life, held the essential equality of presbyters to bishops; and with this he combined three other opinions—that prayer for the dead was useless, that it was wrong to observe stated fasts, and that to keep the "Paschal" festival was to Judaize. For whatever reason, probably as a relief from a growing authoritative insistence on Church observances, Aerianism became popular; crowds of men and women went after Aerius; and when excluded from churches or villages, Aerians were to be seen covered with snow, camping out in woods and under rocks. According to a Latin writer, the Aerians were fanatical in the matter of individual abstinence, so as even to approximate to the Encratism of the second century, which still had numerous adherents in Pisidia, in other parts of Asia Minor, and even in the vicinity of Antioch.

Of the old Gnostic sects, Marcionism continued to energize in Cyprus, even as some fifty years later it prevailed in many villages of North Syria; and the Valentinians, as we have heard, had a foothold in Osrhoene. In Galatia, the old pagan wildness and extravagance seemed to reappear in the fantastic rites of the Ascitæ or Ascodrogitæ around an inflated bladder. The Artotyritæ substituted cheese for wine in their Eucharist; the Hydroparastatæ were rigid "teetotallers;" the Tascodrogitæ were a set of mystics whose religion consisted in a sort of Trappist taciturnity; the Saccophori went about like Elijah, in rough haircloth; the Apotactitæ were communists who forswore all property.

It is needless to go further into this luxuriant growth of fanatical heterodoxy. The Emperor Theodosius, since the Council of 383 and the laws of that year against heretics, had continued to denounce them, ordering the ejection of their so-called priests and ministers, and specially, to the great satisfaction of Gregory Nazianzen, commanding that the Apollinarians should be forbidden to hold any meetings or to perpetuate their ministry. This latter enactment was early in 388: on the 14th of June in that year the rhetorical style of these edicts is again employed to heap obloquy on the various misbelieving sects, who have entered

into "a miserable conspiracy against God, and who must not be allowed to set up altars for their transgression, to lift up hands in impious worship, to simulate the mysteries of the true religion;" and two days later, by way of striking at the ordinary modes of heretical proselytism, the Emperor forbade all public discussions about religion. On the 8th of August he disowned, as spurious, a supposed grant of freedom of action, on which some Arians relied; in 389 testamentary powers were taken away from the Eunomians and, as we have seen, from the Manicheans; and all ministers of the sects were forbidden to hold meetings even in the suburbs of cities. It is carefully noted by Socrates that the Novatian meetings and services were excepted from prohibitory laws.

The schism of Antioch, which had not been healed by the death of Meletius in 381, was similarly protracted after the death of Paulinus, in or about 388 or 389. According to Theodoret, Paulinus had consecrated, during his own lifetime, his successor in the episcopate of the Eustathians; the person whom he chose was Evagrius, a friend of Jerome, who as far back as 374 spoke warmly of his tender kindness, and still earlier, of his labours in Christ's cause. As to this consecration, the anomalousness of the circumstances probably seemed to Paulinus to warrant a departure from ordinary rule; for although he was not likely to feel any special respect for the authority of the Dedication Council, which in its twenty-third canon had pronounced that the consecration of a successor by a bishop at the point of death should be treated as null and void, he would, of course, be aware of the requirement of more prelates than one to perform a consecration according to form and rule, and also of the canon which ordained that the comprovincial bishops, or as many of them as could attend, should take part in the appointment of every prelate. But he knew that in times of exceptional difficulty such rules had been dispensed with; and the case of his own flock at Antioch appeared to him to be painfully exceptional. He may have acted wrongly in the matter; it may be that his duty was to bid his people acknowledge Flavian; but Flavian was to him, and to them, not merely the successor of Meletius, but the violator of a solemn pledge, the perpetuator of a bitter and factious enmity. He could not bear to leave his congregation in such hands; he therefore committed them to the care of Evagrius. It is indeed from Theodoret only that we learn these circumstances as to Evagrius's consecration; from Socrates and Sozomen it would appear simply a case of election of a successor

after the former bishop's death, though not, of course, in a provincial synod; but Theodoret may have possessed some fuller information. Evagrius was at any rate acknowledged by the Westerns, who had fraternised with Paulinus; and the dispute between his friends and those of Flavian became a new cause of widespread difference.

The Westerns earnestly desired the Emperor to let the question be decided by a Council. Theodosius, who had returned to Constantinople in the autumn of 391—two or three years after the death of Paulinus—appears to have directed Flavian to attend a Council which was to meet for this purpose at Capua. Flavian excused himself for the time on the ground that he could not stand a voyage in winter, but sent no one in his stead. The Council assembled; a large number of bishops, including several from beyond sea, and many who had travelled to Capua at great inconvenience, might be considered to represent the West. Flavian's absence, despite his excuses, told against him, and he was regarded as a defaulter; his rival Evagrius had taken care to be present, and the bishops' opinion inclined not unnaturally in his favour, as the representative of the party which had all along enjoyed Western support. But the Council, feeling itself imperfectly informed, decided on referring the case for judgment to Theophilus, the bishop of Alexandria, as likely to be impartial; and in another case it showed the same disposition to transfer the responsibility of decision to persons possessing local knowledge. Bonosus, bishop of Sardica, whether he had, or had not, adopted the Photinian Christology, at any rate held the Helvidian opinion, and was therefore accused as heterodox. The Council thought that he would be most appropriately tried by the bishops of Macedonia, under their primate Anysius, bishop of Thessalonica. These prelates suspended Bonosus, but tried to shift the case back to their brethren of Italy; the attempt was overruled, and Bonosus was tried and condemned by Anysius.

In the matter of Antioch and its rival bishops, the Council's resolution came to nothing. Flavian had recourse to petitions to the Emperor, and endeavoured to procure rescripts in his own favour; Theophilus reported this to Ambrose, who advised him to "summon Flavian again," and to confer with Siricius before coming to a decisive award. According to Theodoret, a conversation took place between Theodosius and Flavian, after the former had been urged by Siricius "not to suffer the laws of Christ to be insulted with impunity." Flavian's adroit line had much appearance

of dignity and unselfishness: "If my doctrine or conduct is impugned, I will appear even before personal enemies as judges. But if the question is only as to my episcopal right, I waive it, and place the bishopric of Antioch at your disposal." He probably knew that Theodosius would not take advantage of this offer; on the contrary, he was bidden to return to his see, and his difficulties were soon lessened by the death of Evagrius—after which event the Eustathian episcopate came to an end, for Flavian prevented the appointment of a successor. The Eustathian community persevered, without a bishop, in their separation, for about twenty-two years afterwards; but Flavian was, after a shorter period, admitted to the fellowship of Egypt and the West.

Such was the state of matters at Antioch. At Constantinople Nectarius's administration does not seem to have been successful in a religious sense. The Church's tone became secularised: a number of bishops, frequently visiting the imperial city, and forming a kind of council round its bishop, imbibed the spirit of intriguing courtiers; the dwelling of Nectarius himself, with its rich furniture, and the silk robes in which he himself was ordinarily to be seen, indicated, as Tillemont expresses it, that the prelate whose antecedents had been so unecclesiastical "preferred the magnificence of a senator to the poverty of Jesus Christ." Many of the clergy became mere men of the world, indulging freely in pleasures of every sort, and disregarding the Church's rules; monastic discipline was tending to become lax; and a terrible scandal induced Nectarius, by the advice of a presbyter, to abolish the office of the Penitentiary priest, who was accustomed—probably ever since the Novatian schism—to receive private confessions, and either to give directions as to the public penance which might be necessary, or else assure the penitents that they need not come forward as such at church, but must go through certain penitential exercises at home. The abolition of this office, says Socrates, left every one free to consult his own conscience as to whether he should receive the Holy Mysteries; and both he and Sozomen indicate their disapprobation of the laxity thus introduced into Church life. The effect of the step taken by Nectarius was, strictly speaking—as Valesius says—"neither to prohibit confession nor to abrogate penance." Before the Penitentiary's office was constituted, Christians whose consciences were burdened with sin used either to confess, privately, to any spiritual physician whom they chose for the purpose, or to dispense with such confession altogether. While

the office lasted, the desirableness of such confession was brought more prominently before the people's mind, and it was known that whoever wished to confess must resort to one appointed functionary. And after the office was suppressed, it was left free to Christians, as before, "to open their griefs" to any bishop or presbyter whom they might prefer; and if he so directed them, to place themselves publicly in the ranks of penitents: they might do this, or they might leave it undone: but the absence of any Penitentiary removed a great stimulus to confession, threw the whole subject into the background, and practically led many persons, who would otherwise have used confession, to neglect it—not without grave detriment, as our Church historians tell us, to themselves.

The Church of Alexandria had been governed, since the summer of 385, by a prelate whose career is, on the whole, one of the saddest examples of the effect of secularising influences upon the priesthood of the Theodosian age. "A bold, bad man, whose hands were alternately polluted with gold and with blood:" such is the pointed epigrammatic censure of Gibbon, which is, indeed, not much severer than Neale's assertion of his "total want of principle" and of "personal piety," but which should not be accepted without qualification as a full account of the character of a man who had some merits as well as undoubted abilities, and was probably corrupted by the great powers of his official position. Theophilus, whose name is so unhappily associated with the persecution of St. Chrysostom, was possessed with a zeal which, indeed, ran into violent excesses, but was, at the root of it, most probably genuine and religious, for the destruction of pagan idolatry. The opportunities for carrying out this design were greater than under any preceding monarch, and paganism itself, though in many places strong, or even furious and obstinate, was weaker than it had been under Constantius or Jovian. The princes of the house of Constantine had indeed put forth laws for the "cessation of superstition and of senseless heathen sacrifices," for the closing of the temples, for the abolition of nocturnal sacrifices, and, in fact, of all sacrifices; but their will had had but partial effect. Theodosius had begun his reign with indications of earnest purposes against paganism; but his first edict, at the close of 381, had implied that only a certain class of sacrifices, those which were offered in order to "consult" the heathen deities about the future, were absolutely forbidden. In 382 he had permitted a temple of great celebrity in Osrhoene to remain and to be resorted to for oracles, provided that unlawful sacrifices were

not performed therein. Yet it is not unlikely that individual Christians sometimes took upon themselves, under his reign, to destroy temples in the "Oriental diocese," as Martin had done in Gaul; and Libanius, like a pagan "Spelman," affirms that those who have built houses out of the stones of ruined temples either have incurred or will incur the punishment of sacrilege. But Marcellus, bishop of Apamea, appears to have used for this work the authority of an imperial order, addressed to Cynegius, prætorian prefect of the East, who was commissioned in 389 to cause temples to be closed. Marcellus procured the destruction of a strongly built temple in his own city; but his zeal led him to organize an attack on a temple guarded by pagans who, making a sally and finding him alone in the camp, detained by gout from accompanying the assailants, seized him and burnt him to death.

It was in the opening of this same year 389 that Theophilus, having obtained the Emperor's leave to build a church on ground occupied by a deserted temple of Bacchus or Osiris, proceeded to clear away the decaying ruins, and explore the crypts that lay beneath. In these dark recesses were discovered several emblems of the abominations of that ritual in which the grossest sensualism was adopted into religious observances, and the so-called religion was elaborately brutalised. These symbols Theophilus exposed to the public scorn and abhorrence. The pagans, enraged, fell fiercely on the Christians, and took possession of the great temple of Serapis as their natural stronghold in such a strife. Serapis was a deity whose worship was established under the Ptolemies, to represent the identification of Apis and Osiris—the unity of the principle of physical life, appearing in the sacred bull, with the many-sided power revered as the Sun-god, as the fertilising Nile, as Judge and King in the underworld; and Julian had quoted an oracular verse, identifying him with Zeus, Pluto, and the Sun. In his honour was raised the great square mound with its ascent of a hundred steps, and on its summit an extensive area enclosed by halls and chambers and encompassing the superb Serapeum proper, the temple of the god. This structure, which Ammianus reckons next in grandeur to the Capitol, was supported by four hundred columns of costly marble, and in its inner sanctuary was seated the vast image, formed of gold, silver, brass, iron, lead, and tin, with gorgeous inlaid work of sapphires and emeralds; its colour a dark purple, its aspect that of an aged man, its huge arms stretched out so as to touch the wall on either hand; on its head a basket of bushel-

size, "the emblem of productiveness or plenty." It was a visible expression of the effort of paganism to concentrate into one object of worship the attributes of the most popular deities—to provide itself with an idol complete in manifold attractions, and expressing all the forms of its idea. Here, then, as in an appropriate fastness, an embodied defiance to Christianity, the pagans gathered themselves in force, and made sallies from it on the Christians, several of whom they took prisoners, carried them within the Serapean precinct, and tortured them savagely in order to make them offer sacrifices. The "dark places" of that unholy stronghold of heathenism were now, in the fullest sense, "habitations of cruelty." Prisoners were crucified, or their legs were broken and, thus disabled, they were hurled down into the deep pits constructed for receiving the blood of the sacrifices. Impunity gave confidence, day after day, to this strange garrison; at last they appointed as governor a philosopher named Olympius, who had come from Cilicia expressly to devote his life to the service of Serapis. He was inspired with a fierce antichristian fanaticism; he felt that it was, for him and his order, a quarrel of life and death. Under his encouragement, the pagans in the Serapeum utterly refused to obey the summons to surrender which was formally made by messengers from the city magistrates. They resolved to hold out, and their distress at the recent destruction of the Dionysiac images was allayed by their leader's assurance that the powers represented by those symbols had ascended scatheless into heaven. Instructions having been asked for from Theodosius, an imperial rescript arrived, and was solemnly read to a mingled crowd of Christians and pagans at the foot of the Serapeum hill. "Let not the magistrates," so wrote the Emperor, "impute the blame of recent disturbances to the Christians; the pagans alone, with their superstitious fanaticism and barbarity, were in fault." As these words were read, a loud triumphant cheer broke forth from the Christians: the pagans, terror-struck, tried to escape down the narrow streets or lanes which permeated that old quarter of the city, or even to seek safety by mingling among the Christian groups. The rescript proceeded to describe the Christians murdered within the Serapeum as martyrs, whose glory was not to be tarnished by any judicial vengeance for their blood: a leniency for which Sozomen accounts by the motive that it would induce the pagans to embrace Christianity "out of regard for the kindness shown them." Then came the point of the whole mandate: the Serapeum, and all the Alexandrian temples,

were to be destroyed. There was no further resistance. The military force ascended the steps, and penetrated into the temple. Its occupants, availing themselves, doubtless, of some secret passages, had escaped. Olympius, according to the grand story which the Christians believed, and which Sozomen cautiously reports, had heard, at dead of night, the sound of a single voice chanting Alleluia within the closed doors of the inmost sanctuary, and, understanding that sign, had hurried to the harbour and taken ship for Italy; while Helladius and Ammonius, two grammarians and priests, of whom the former had "with his own hand slain," as he afterwards boasted, "nine Christians in this conflict," made their way to Constantinople, and lived long after to talk of these events to a young student, the future Church historian Socrates. The image of Serapis was now, in pursuance of the mandate, to be broken in pieces. But for a moment or two, the excited crowd that had invaded its presence stood irresolute, unable to shake off all superstitious dread, or to forget the oft-repeated prophecy that, if it were touched by human hand, the sky would fall and earth would sink into chaos. Then it was that Theophilus, "looking scornfully," says Theodoret, "on the colossal image as a dead helpless thing," turned to a soldier who had an axe in his hand, and bade him strike with a good will. He struck the image on the cheek; he struck again, and a third time: the vast form came crashing down, and from the shattered head rushed out a swarm of mice; the head was dragged along the floor, the basket which crowned it broken, the limbs dissevered and fastened to ropes, to be exposed to public derision, and the trunk, at last, burned in the amphitheatre. "This was the end," says Rufinus, "of the ancient imposture of Serapis." Other temples shared the fate of the Serapeum; horrible secrets came to light in their foul "adyta:" a priest named Tyrannus, who had infamously abused the credulity of the votaries of Saturn, was put to the torture, and confessed his guilt; and all the images of the gods were melted down into vessels for use in the churches, with the exception of one, which the archbishop commanded to be set up entire in a public place, in memorial of what pagan worship had been: it was the image of an ape.

In many places, it seems, the local bishop thought it more prudent to leave a temple standing and utilise it as a church. But at Canopus, where pagan superstition was even more rife than in Alexandria, the fanes were levelled to the ground; and on the platform of the Serapeum, a "Martyrium" and a church confronted

each other. In place of the emblems called "breastplates of Serapis," the cross was painted on doors and windows, walls and columns; but pagans who saw the change declared that the cross was one of the "hieratic" symbols of the Egyptian alphabet, and signified "the life to come." The Nile-gauge, or "cubit," which had been kept in the Serapeum, and used, as Shakespeare has it, for "taking the flow o' the Nile" in its inundation "by certain scales o' the pyramid," was transferred—not without many pagan forebodings, falsified by a very abundant inundation—"to the church of Him who was Lord of the waters:" and Theodosius, on hearing of these proceedings, spread forth his hands to heaven, and exclaimed, "Thanks to Thee, O Christ, that so ancient a delusion has been extinguished without ruin to that great city!"

Such a downfall of the old superstitions produced many conversions from paganism to the faith; and Theodosius, as a sincere Christian, might well exult in the results of his rescript as to the destruction of the Serapeum. In the June of 391 he addressed a new order to the "Augustal prefect" of Egypt, Evagrius, and to the Count Romanus, in the following absolute terms: "Let no one be allowed to sacrifice; let no one go round the temples; let no one venerate pagan sanctuaries; let all understand that the access to such unholy places is closed to them by the interposition of our law." A judge who in the time of his administration should abuse his position by entering such places was to pay a large fine; and his staff of officials was to be equally mulcted, unless they had combined to withstand him. This law was followed up, on the 8th of November, 392, by the most stringent of all imperial enactments against paganism. It was a blow at the whole system, somewhat like the stroke of the soldier's axe at the head of Serapis.

Nullus omnino—the first words of this memorable ordinance are significant of its tenor. "Let no one of any class or order of men, or of dignity, or in a place of power, or invested with office, be he powerful in virtue of birth, or lowly in descent, condition, or fortune, in any place whatever, in any city, either kill a guiltless victim in honour of senseless images—or, by a more secret form of guilt, venerating the Lar with fire, the genius with wine, the Penates with fume, kindle lights, put on incense, or hang up garlands." Secondly, "if any one shall dare to slay a victim with intent to sacrifice, or consult breathing entrails, let him, as if guilty of treason, be delated as a criminal—the business of accusing being free to all; and let him then receive sentence befitting his

crime, even though he has made no inquiries (by occult art) either contrary to the well-being of the Emperor or simply concerning it. For it suffices to constitute crime, that a man shall wish to transgress the laws of nature itself, to pursue unlawful inquiries, to penetrate secrets, to attempt what is forbidden, to seek for a termination to another's welfare, to promise hopes of another's death" (that is, although that other be not the Emperor). Thirdly, the law enacted that "any one who should honour images with incense, or by hanging fillets on trees, or raising altars of turf, should forfeit the place or possession in which he had practised such heathenish superstitions: for all places in which it shall be proved that incense-fumes have ascended—provided such places are shown to be the property of the incense-burners—are forfeit to the imperial treasury." Fourthly, as to cases where the sacrificer was not the owner of the place, a fine was imposed on the owner, if proved to be ignorant of the act; if he connived at it, he was to incur the like penalty with the sacrificer. Neglect to enforce this law, on the part of town functionaries, was to be punished by judicial action; if judges were slack in their duty, they and their subordinates should be heavily fined.

Such was the great law of 392, the last of the anti-pagan edicts of Theodosius. It swept away various pretexts under which the pagans who might dread to violate former laws had contrived to keep up, under the appearance of convivial meetings, some of the milder forms of their old worship. It aimed at closing up all loopholes of freedom for any rite which belonged to that worship; it placed the burning of incense, or the wreathing of a garland, under the same ban with the offering of bloody sacrifices; it would fain crush out the whole of that vast and many-sided mass of idolatries which, thirty years before, had again secured the enthusiastic support of an emperor, and had, since those days, been largely tolerated by sovereigns who did not venture to proscribe it. The law which now went forth was dated from Constantinople, and was, properly speaking, a law merely for the East, since Theodosius, before he quitted Italy, had restored Valentinian to the throne of the Western empire, including the territories which had once owned his brother's rule. But previous to this restitution, Theodosius had united Valentinian's name with his own in a law for the Western empire, promulgated in the February of 391, forbidding any one to "pollute himself with sacrifices, to visit heathen temples, or to reverence images made by human art."

The effect of his prohibitions was greater in the East than in the West; his son Arcadius, indeed, had to renew the order that no one should visit temples for purposes of sacrifice, to abolish the privileges previously enjoyed by pagan priests, and to command that temples in the country should be pulled down "without crowds or tumult." Theodosius II., in 416, placed pagans under civil disqualification; in 423 he inserted in a law his belief that no pagans still existed, but in a later law of that same year he practically recalled this statement by inflicting penalties on any persons detected in pagan worship, and by the last law of the anti-pagan series, dated November 13, 426, again interdicted all pagan sacrifices prohibited by former laws, and commanded all pagan temples, "if any still remained entire," to be "destroyed by order of the magistracy, and expiated by the erection of the sign of the venerable Christian religion."

That paganism, even in Eastern districts, "died hard," may be taken as certain; although few places in the East might in this respect resemble Charræ, which "preserved its pagan traditions until deep into the middle ages." But in the West the strength of paganism was much greater, its tenacious vitality much more conspicuous. Honorius, while continuing his father's prohibition of pagan worship, and even of such "banquets" as had a pagan significance, prefers to uphold some temples as buildings, fearing, doubtless, what might be the effect of pulling them down in the midst of a fanatical population; but he does order such temples as stood on private property to be destroyed by their owners. There was indeed throughout the West, and especially in Africa, a long battle to be waged against the rallyings, so to speak, of pagan enthusiasm; we shall see how fierce these were in the earlier years of Augustine's episcopate. At moments of popular excitement, of terror, or of wrath, Christians might be endangered; at any rate, pagan voices would often be loudly raised, ascribing the calamities of the empire to the wrath of the abandoned and insulted gods. Here and there, again and again, with more or less of secrecy, the old worship was renewed: not only did many Carthaginians pay secret adoration to the goddess Cælestis, and village populations, by their persistency in their old superstitions, cause the name "pagani" to acquire the same force as our own word "heathen," but in great centres of European life the old idolatry was long represented by customs which had a political importance, and Christians had to be warned, even by language in their liturgies, against

mingling in idolatrous observances on this or that day of the year or of the week; and just as Pope Gelasius, a century later, was fain to argue against the festival of the Lupercalia, so a successor of his, in the eighth century, was admonished by St. Boniface to purge Rome of popular customs essentially heathenish. Such difficulties would be increased by the strange fashion of combining pagan with Christian emblems in the churches of "the City" itself, of which Lanciani gives evidence in his "Pagan and Christian Rome."

But we must not pursue this subject, profoundly and mournfully interesting though it be to survey the protracted resistance of the heathen spirit, even when banished to desolate moors and forest recesses, and clinging (as Anglo-Saxon canons show) to the neighbourhood of particular trees or wells or rocks. Not at the bidding of any Christian autocrat would the evil spirit abandon its old home: slowly, inch by inch, it retreated, lurking in secret places when it was driven from public sight, contesting the ground wherever it dared, insinuating itself into folds and nooks of professedly Christian life, bringing Christians back under the bondage of superstitious terror, and illustrating, through long ages, the awful significance of the title of "the Prince of this world." Against some of these old-world usages the Church steadily set her face. The practice of them was hidden from the clergy; they were carried on in remote parts among the peasantry, even as in some districts of Scotland, within the nineteenth century, animals were killed or buried alive with a vague notion of appeasing malignant powers. In other cases it was thought prudent to avoid the risk of alienating a "converted" population by demanding an absolute surrender of what had so long been cherished, and a compromise was made by associating this or that observance with Christian sanctities in the hope of rendering it harmless: but this sometimes left the pagan element alive and potent under a thin veneer of Christianity; so hard was the task of purging out the old leaven. But while one must not imagine that heathenism was suppressed by any edict, even of a Theodosius, there is no doubt that his policy did inflict a deadly wound on "the wild beast," and that, as the Church historians tell us, many pagans came over to the faith under impressions produced by such scenes as the taking of the Serapeum.

The year of the great edict had witnessed the closing tragedy of the dynasty of Valentinian. The young Western Emperor, just

twenty-one years old, had given of late, in his second reign, fair promise of an excellent future. He was temperate, pure, affectionate, impartially just, and sufficiently self-controlled to profit by reported criticism on his own tastes and to show that he was no self-indulgent weakling—as when, to take a curious instance, he promptly put to death the wild beasts kept for his amusement, or when he resolved to avoid the circus-games at the certain risk of unpopularity. He could rebuke the slanderous accuser of some rich nobles, and refused to add to that burden of over-taxed provincials which made life a misery to the taxpayers of Gaul. He was in Gaul when the pagan senators made a fourth attempt to recover their altar of Victory: he needed no prompting from Ambrose, then at Milan, to refuse the request, and that in the face of advice given on grounds of policy by his Christian privy-councillors. He had shaken off the Arian influence of his mother, and was avowedly a Catholic—and yet he was still unbaptized; the bad old fashion of postponing the initiatory sacrament was thus once again exemplified in an Emperor. He was unfortunate in his Gallic Master of the Soldiery, Arbogast, a member of the fierce and treacherous Frankish nation, who succeeded in making him practically a prisoner at Vienne, and almost depriving him of the imperial dignity. Lonely, helpless, alarmed for his personal safety, and so desirous to receive baptism from Ambrose—unreasonably, Ambrose thought, yet amiably—that he would not call in a Gallic bishop to confer it, he sent one of those guards of his chamber who were called significantly "Silentiaries," entreating Ambrose to come quickly into Gaul. The messenger started on the evening of Thursday, May 13, 392, either just before or just after a violent altercation between Valentinian and Arbogast, in which the Emperor said, "I will rather die than let my friends be harmed." On the Saturday, which was Whitsun-eve, he was strangled, either by agents of Arbogast who came behind him while he was playfully dipping his lips in the Rhone, or during his sleep by chamberlains who had been bribed by a tool of Arbogast, named Eugenius, a former secretary of state. Murdered he certainly was, but even Augustine was not sure of the circumstances. Ambrose had already started for Vienne, had even crossed the Alps, when he heard of the catastrophe: he returned home, and wrote to Theodosius about it; and when the remains of the murdered prince were brought to Milan in a beautiful porphyry sarcophagus, Ambrose pronounced the *Consolatio* or funeral address, memorable as formulating the doctrine which became a commonplace among

Western theologians, that the desire of baptism, where the sacrament itself could not be had, secured its grace, even as an unchristened man dying a martyr was "washed in his own blood." The application of this doctrine to Valentinian's pious wish involved an indulgent view of the case, because the poor young Emperor was well within reach of Christian ministry in the city which the martyrs of 177 had made so illustrious.

Eugenius has just come before us as possibly guilty of that innocent blood. He had been a schoolmaster as well as a state official; he was an eloquent rhetorician, doubtless at heart a pagan; he now received from Arbogast the ensigns of majesty, and one of his first acts was to license the re-erection of the Victory-altar. A courteous letter of his to Ambrose did not remove suspicion, nor produce a direct reply; but early in 393 both Eugenius and Arbogast came from Gaul into Italy, and Ambrose withdrew from Milan in order to avoid meeting them. He wrote, however, to Eugenius, pointing out the inconsistency of his Christian professions with concessions to pagan importunity; and he withheld the communion of the Milanese Church from both Emperor and Emperor-maker, whereupon the savage Frank, with Flavian the pagan prefect, vowed that, when they should come back victorious from the impending contest with Theodosius, they would turn the great basilica into a stable and compel the clergy to serve in the ranks. In fact, the revolutionists openly proclaimed themselves chiefs of a pagan reaction, and the pagan majority in the senate took heart once more. Temples that had been closed were opened for pagan worship; various pagan rites, native and foreign, were triumphantly performed in Rome itself; a huge statue of Jupiter, with golden thunderbolts in its hand, was set up above the fortifications of the Julian Alps; and all alike, pagans or Christians, must have listened to tidings of Theodosius's westward march with fear or hope in their most intense form. It would be a day of decision indeed; and so it was, that 6th of September, 394, when Theodosius, having reached the neighbourhood of Aquileia, and sustained some loss in a preliminary engagement, determined to risk another battle, and if possible pierce through the line of enemies by which he was in danger of being hemmed in. He could not, he said, allow the standard of the Cross to retreat before the image of Hercules now borne in front of the pagan army. He ordered a charge, and the result was a great victory near the river Frigidus. Eugenius was captured and slain, Arbogast and Flavian fled and slew themselves.

It was felt by Christians to be a token in favour of Christianity, and the Christian spirit was actually exhibited by the conqueror's kindness to the sons of Eugenius, whom he caused to be brought up as Christians and maintained in positions of honour, as well as by the mercy which he extended to some who had implored the intercession of Ambrose.

If those Churchmen who saw Theodosius as monarch of the Roman world at Milan in the autumn of 394, could have looked round Christendom from that virtually central point, what would have struck them as conspicuous phenomena?

Siricius was still governing the Roman Church, which was gaining repeated accessions of converts from the highest ranks of Roman society: though, if Zosimus was rightly informed, when Theodosius exhorted the senate to abandon the "error" of idolatry and "adopt the Christian faith, which offered deliverance from all sin and all impiety," he was met by an absolute refusal, on the ground that the old rites had "kept Rome invincible for nearly twelve hundred years." Within the Christian circles Jerome's unmeasured abuse of Jovinian and vehement depreciation of the married life had excited much perplexity and displeasure, so that his learned and pious friend Pammachius, the son-in-law of Paula and cousin of Marcella, withdrew as many copies of the work "Against Jovinian" as he could lay hold of; and Jerome, being informed by him of the effect which his passionate words had produced, wrote what he called a "Defence," explaining and softening them, and insisting that he had allowed marriage to be honourable, and to be in fact a divine gift, though inferior to the higher portion of celibacy. But it was characteristic of him to close this paper with the words, "We have to choose whether we will follow Lazarus or the rich man." His letters, although obviously tinged with morose exaggeration of Roman luxury and self-indulgence, and often dashed off, as he says, in circumstances which gave him no time to revise them, may show us that there were dangers to Christian principle and consistency in the wealthy and refined social life of the ancient capital—dangers from which several of the Roman clergy had proved themselves to be by no means exempt.

In northern Italy Chromatius was presiding at Aquileia; Gaudentius was governing the Church of Brescia; Placentia was under the care of a friend of Ambrose, bishop Sabinus; at Trent, Vigilius had begun an episcopate which was to close in martyrdom.

In Gaul, Martin was approaching his eightieth year; Victricius, who was afterwards wronged by harsh judgments as to his orthodoxy, had begun his active episcopate at Rouen; and, apparently in 394, twenty-one bishops had met in council at Nismes, and passed some canons of Church discipline. In Spain a remarkable abandonment of high secular office for the Christian priesthood had been seen in the person of Paulinus, the son of a prætorian prefect, who was ere long to become a correspondent of Augustine, to settle at Nola in Campania, and to devote himself with ill-regulated enthusiasm to a "cultus" of the local saint, Felix.

In Africa, Genethlius of Carthage, after holding a Council in 390, had been succeeded in 392 by Aurelius, who in 393 had assembled a plenary Council of African bishops in the basilica of Peace at Hippo; and before this assembly Augustine, the recently ordained priest, delivered a discourse on doctrine. The controversy with Donatism was still active, but the Donatists themselves were now involved in a serious schism, for their bishop at Carthage, Primianus, had made an enemy of his deacon Maximianus, who organized a party, and procured a condemnation of Primianus by more than a hundred Donatist bishops at Cabarsussi or Cebarsussa in 393. These prelates appointed Maximianus to the bishopric; but Primianus, on his side, assembled at Bagaia or Baga, in April, 394, three hundred and ten bishops, who excommunicated Maximianus as a schismatic and a rebel, including twelve adherents of his in the same censure. Herein appeared, as Augustine fails not to remind the Donatists, a likeness or repetition, within their own circles, of the treatment which their predecessors had dealt out to the Catholic bishop of Carthage at the beginning of their movement. As Majorinus had been set up against Cæcilian, so was Maximianus against Primianus. If the Council of Bagaia had a right to condemn Maximianus, and to insist on the legitimacy of the episcopate of Primianus, the Catholic Councils had a right to condemn the whole Donatist body. The Donatist majority, in short, had no better ground as against the Donatist minority than the Church had against them—nor, indeed, so good. They were but reaping what they had sown—"the engineer was hoist with his own petard;" and when they invoked the civil power against their rivals, in order to deprive them of churches, they stopped their own mouths as to governmental action in behalf of Catholics. But the African Church itself, of this time, was by no

means free from confusions and abuses; a litigious unbrotherly spirit and a self-asserting factiousness were rife among bishops, and the senior prelate, who as such acted as a metropolitan, was disposed to assume too lordly a tone; as bishops sometimes invaded each other's rights, so presbyters took occasion to overstep the functions of their own order; there was a carelessness as to the Church service, a neglect of the rule of fasting communion, an unclerical laxity of habits within the ecclesiastical body, a want of due care as to the qualifications for ordination, in some places an exceeding deficiency of clergy, which made it desirable to admit conforming Donatist clergy to serve in the Church, if only they had not personally rebaptized. And Augustine had to entreat the bishop of Carthage to forbid the revelries which, professedly in honour of the martyrs, and, in the estimation of the ignorant, connected with, or contributing to, the "solace of the departed," were almost daily being held at martyr-shrines, and within the house of God. This scandalous perversion of the ancient Agapæ had been suppressed, where it had existed, in Italy and other countries; in Africa great caution and gentleness would be required for its effective abolition.

If we look from Western to Eastern Africa, we shall find that the Egyptian monks of this period included Arsenius, who had been tutor to the two sons of Theodosius, Arcadius and Honorius, and had recently fled from Court, in despair of doing any good at his post, and in a passionate longing for quiet and solitude; he dwelt in the wilderness of Scetis, where were still to be found some who had listened to St. Antony. John Cassian, who about this time visited the Egyptian monasteries and hermitages, found a great multitude of recluses in the hill country where Antony had lived: fourteen hundred monks at Tabenne, five hundred at "the Cells," five thousand in Nitria, about two thousand near Alexandria—in all above seventy-six thousand, generally attired alike, in tunic, cape, and sheepskin; observing a regular order of prayers, according to which, at nocturns and in the evening, they recited twelve psalms and two lessons, besides meeting for the Eucharist on Sunday and Saturday, and uniting the work of making mats with devotion; the more conspicuous among them often conversing with true spiritual insight, the result of deep experience; the average monks greatly tried by various temptations, often falling, often tenderly and discriminatingly treated by their elders or "abbots;" sometimes exhibiting, amid

their earnestness, no small amount of morbid fanaticism; sometimes rising above the hardness and narrowness which monastic life so often nurtured, and showing a strange power of sympathy and a truly Christian temper of soul.

In the neighbouring country of Palestine there were many recluses, but one thinks mainly of the great student of Bethlehem. He had completed, before 391, his correction of the current Latin version of the Septuagint; he had then commenced, and for the most part completed, a new translation from the Hebrew, which, after a long struggle with the older forms of the Latin Bible, gradually won its way to universal acceptance as the authoritative version, or "Vulgate," of the whole Western Church; and he had had experience of the bitter and narrow-minded criticism of those "detractors" who could not appreciate the value of such work, and who disliked the disturbance of traditions which it would involve. But his quiet labours had been troubled by a controversy, which was destined to become at once a scandal and a sorrow. A certain Aterbius had come in 393 to Jerusalem, and denounced Rufinus, then living there, as a follower of Origen in his peculiar speculations,—including Jerome in his vehement censures. The two friends took this treatment differently: Rufinus remained shut up in his house without a word; Jerome disowned the charge of being an "Origenist," although, he said, he had admired much in Origen's writings. This was the beginning of a historic quarrel. In 394, about Easter, Epiphanius came to Jerusalem, and conversed with John, the bishop, as to the dangers of Origenistic thought, referring especially to its excessive "Subordinationism," its Platonism on the pre-existence of souls, its ultra-allegorism, its supposed thoroughgoing Universalism. He then visited Jerome, and also Rufinus, to whom he offered the kiss of peace; and afterwards he thought himself called upon to preach in the church of the Resurrection denouncing "Origenism," and thus virtually attacking the bishop of Jerusalem, whom he regarded as to some extent an Origenist. This was naturally resented by John, who sent his archdeacon to desire the foreign prelate to be silent, and both by glances and words expressed his opinion that Epiphanius was in his dotage. The congregation adjourned to the Golgotha chapel on the supposed site of the Crucifixion. Epiphanius was greeted on all sides with enthusiastic reverence, which could not but be irritating to John, who in a violent speech, accompanied by significant gestures, attacked the coarse materialising

conceptions of God which, as he intimated, were usually entertained by unintellectual denouncers of Origen. Epiphanius, with unusual moderation, arose, "greeted the Church with voice and hand," and said quietly, "All that my brother in office, my son in age, has said against the Anthropomorphites' heresy was well and faithfully spoken. I also condemn that heresy; but it is only fair that we should also condemn the perverse dogmas of Origen." This ready-witted reply was welcomed with laughter and applause. Epiphanius retired to Bethlehem, and there, after one brief visit to Jerusalem, fixed his abode for the rest of the year 394; but, while visiting a monastery of his own foundation near Eleutheropolis, he was induced by the urgency of the Bethlehem monks to ordain Paulinianus, Jerome's brother, first deacon and then priest, on each occasion causing his mouth to be stopped by a number of deacons, "lest he should adjure Epiphanius in the name of Christ to set him free." The motive of this strange proceeding was not likely to abate John's natural displeasure at what he of course regarded as a grave irregularity; it was to provide the monks with a priest who could officiate for them—Jerome always, from a fanatical kind of humility, refrained from officiating—when they were separate, as virtually he thought them now separate, from the communion of John. Epiphanius had all the hard, narrow, and arbitrary ways of thinking and acting which would be likely to belong to an old man who imagined himself a privileged person, and had long taken his own line (as he did in a later controversy) without regard for other considerations; he acted for himself without any misgiving, and long controversial habits had made his zeal for orthodoxy, or for what he thought right as to Church worship and arrangements, peculiarly rigid and austere. Thus began a twofold controversy—referring generally to the question of the theological merits or demerits of Origen's peculiar spiritualism, and carrying with it a particular and painfully acrimonious dispute between Jerome and Epiphanius on the one hand, and Rufinus and John of Jerusalem on the other.

For the rest, the Church of the Eastern empire was at the end of this year in the enjoyment of considerable tranquillity; but it was about to lose two at least of its chief ornaments, for Gregory of Nyssa and Amphilochius of Iconium were now passing from the scene—Gregory, at any rate, does not appear after the Council of Constantinople of this autumn, and Amphilochius can hardly have lived much longer. But the departure of any ecclesiastic, however

well known, would seem comparatively an insignificant event in the presence of that great loss which the whole Church, as well as the whole empire, sustained by the death of Theodosius at Milan, on the 17th of January, 395. He had sunk, it is said, into one of his moods of indolence; his constitution lost tone, and he succumbed to dropsy. If ecclesiastical gratitude has praised him overmuch, the reaction which treats Gibbon's "panegyric" as too "ample," and would compare him to a Spanish king of the type of Philip II., seems at least as excessive. The great fault of his character was compatible with a frankness and warm-heartedness which secured the affection, as well as the loyalty, of one who had "tried the good and the evil among men." His last moments were saddened by anxieties for the Church, and cheered by the ministrations of Ambrose; and the event which deprived the Catholic community of so powerful a protector, and left his realm divided between two incapable youths, ushered in an epoch which seemed full of gloom and peril alike to the empire and the Church.

END OF VOL. I.

PRINTED BY WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, LIMITED, LONDON AND BECCLES.

A Classified Catalogue

OF WORKS IN

GENERAL LITERATURE

PUBLISHED BY

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.

39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

91 AND 93 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK, AND 32 HORNBY ROAD, BOMBAY

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
BADMINTON LIBRARY (THE)	12
BIOGRAPHY, PERSONAL MEMOIRS, &c.	9
CHILDREN'S BOOKS	32
CLASSICAL LITERATURE, TRANSLATIONS, ETC.	22
COOKERY, DOMESTIC MANAGEMENT, &c.	36
EVOLUTION, ANTHROPOLOGY, &c.	21
FICTION, HUMOUR, &c.	25
FUR, FEATHER AND FIN SERIES	15
FINE ARTS (THE) AND MUSIC	36
HISTORY, POLITICS, POLITY, POLITICAL MEMOIRS, &c.	3
LANGUAGE, HISTORY AND SCIENCE OF	20
LOGIC, RHETORIC, PSYCHOLOGY, &c.	17
MENTAL, MORAL, AND POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY	17
MISCELLANEOUS AND CRITICAL WORKS	38
POETRY AND THE DRAMA	23
POLITICAL ECONOMY AND ECONOMICS	20
POPULAR SCIENCE	30
RELIGION, THE SCIENCE OF	21
SILVER LIBRARY (THE)	33
SPORT AND PASTIME	12
STONYHURST PHILOSOPHICAL SERIES	19
TRAVEL AND ADVENTURE, THE COLONIES, &c.	11
WORKS OF REFERENCE	31

INDEX OF AUTHORS AND EDITORS.

	Page
Abbott (Evelyn)	3, 22
—— (J. H. M.)	3
—— (T. K.)	17, 18
—— (E. A.)	17
Acland (A. H. D.)	3
Acton (Eliza)	39
Adelborg (O.)	32
Æschylus	22
Ainger (A. C.)	14
Albemarle (Earl of)	13
Alcock (C. W.)	15
Allen (Grant)	30
Allgood (G.)	3
Alverstone (Lord)	15
Angwin (M. C.)	36
Anstey (F.)	25
Aristophanes	22
Aristotle	17
Armstrong (W.)	13
Arnold (Sir Edwin)	11, 23
—— (Dr. T.)	3
Ashbourne (Lord)	3
Ashby (H.)	36
Ashley (W. J.)	3, 20
Avebury (Lord)	21
Ayre (Rev. J.)	31
Bacon	9, 17
Bagehot (W.)	9, 20, 38
Bagwell (R.)	3
Bailey (H. C.)	25
Baillie (A. F.)	3
Bain (Alexander)	17
Baker (J. H.)	38
—— (Sir S. W.)	11
Balfour (A. J.)	13, 21
Ball (John)	11
Banks (M. M.)	24
Baring-Gould (Rev. S.)	21, 38
Barnett (S. A. and H.)	20
Baynes (T. S.)	38
Beaconsfield (Earl of)	25
Beaufort (Duke of)	13, 14
Becker (W. A.)	22
Beesly (A. H.)	9
Bell (Mrs. Hugh)	23
Bent (J. Theodore)	11
Besant (Sir Walter)	3
Bickerdyke (J.)	14, 15
Bird (G.)	23
Blackburne (J. H.)	15
Bland (Mrs. Hubert)	24
Blount (Sir E.)	9
Boase (Rev. C. W.)	6
Boedder (Rev. B.)	19
Bonnell (H. H.)	38
Booth (A. J.)	38
Bottome (P.)	25
Bowen (W. E.)	9
Brassey (Lady)	11
—— (Lord)	14
Bright (Rev. J. F.)	3
Broadfoot (Major W.)	13
Brooks (H. J.)	17
Brown (A. F.)	32
—— (J. Moray)	14
Bruce (R. I.)	3
Bryce (J.)	14
Buck (H. A.)	14
Buckland (Jas.)	32
Buckle (H. T.)	3
Bull (T.)	36
Burke (U. R.)	3
Burne-Jones (Sir E.)	36
Burns (C. L.)	36
Burrows (Montagu)	6
Butler (E. A.)	30
Cameron of Lochiel	15
Campbell (Rev. Lewis)	21, 22
Chasseloup-Laubat (Marquis de)	13
Chesney (Sir G.)	3
Childe-Pemberton (W. S.)	9
Chisholm (G. C.)	31
Cholmondeley-Pennell (H.)	13
Christie (R. C.)	38
Churchill (W. Spencer)	4, 25
Cicero	22
Clarke (Rev. R. F.)	19
Climenson (E. J.)	10
Clodd (Edward)	21, 30
Clutterbuck (W. J.)	12
Colenso (R. J.)	36
Conington (John)	23
Conway (Sir W. M.)	14
Conybeare (Rev. W. J.) & Howson (Dean)	33
Coolidge (W. A. B.)	11
Corbett (Julian S.)	4
Coutts (W.)	22
Coventry (A.)	14
Cox (Harding)	13
Crake (Rev. A. D.)	32
Craven (W. G.)	14
Crawford (J. H.)	25
—— (R.)	11
Creed (S.)	25
Creighton (Bishop)	4, 6, 9
Cross (A. L.)	5
Crozier (J. B.)	9, 17
Custance (Col. H.)	15
Cutts (Rev. E. L.)	6
Dabney (J. P.)	23
Dale (L.)	4
—— (T. F.)	14
Dallinger (F. W.)	5
Dauglish (M. G.)	9
Davenport (A.)	25
Davidson (A. M. C.)	22
—— (W. L.)	17, 20, 21
Davies (J. F.)	22
Dent (C. T.)	14
De Salis (Mrs.)	36
De Tocqueville (A.)	4
Devas (C. S.)	19, 20
Dickinson (G. L.)	4
—— (W. H.)	38
Dougall (L.)	25
Dowden (E.)	40
Doyle (Sir A. Conan)	25
Du Bois (W. E. B.)	5
Dufferin (Marquis of)	14
Dunbar (Mary F.)	25
Dyson (E.)	26
Ebrington (Viscount)	15
Ellis (J. H.)	15
—— (R. L.)	17
Erasmus	9
Evans (Sir John)	38
Falkiner (C. L.)	4
Farrar (Dean)	20, 26
Fitzmaurice (Lord E.)	4
Folkard (H. C.)	15
Ford (H.)	16
Fountain (P.)	11
Fowler (Edith H.)	26
Francis (Francis)	16
Francis (M. E.)	26
Freeman (Edward A.)	6
Fremantle (T. F.)	16
Freshfield (D. W.)	14

INDEX OF AUTHORS AND EDITORS—*continued.*

Page

Frost (G.) 38
Froude (James A.) 4, 9, 11, 26
Fuller (F. W.) 5
Furneaux (W.) 30

Gardiner (Samuel R.) 5
Gathorne-Hardy (Hon. A. E.) 15, 16
Geikie (Rev. Cunningham) 38
Gibbons (J. S.) 15
Gibson (C. H.) 17
Gleig (Rev. G. R.) 10
Gore-Booth (Sir H. W.) 14
Graham (A.) 5
—— (P. A.) 15, 16
—— (G. F.) 20
Granby (Marquess of) 15
Grant (Sir A.) 17
Graves (R. P.) 9
Green (T. Hill) 17, 18
Greene (E. B.) 5
Greville (C. C. F.) 5
Grose (T. H.) 18
Gross (C.) 5
Grove (F. C.) 13
—— (Lady) 11
—— (Mrs. Lilly) 13
Guiney (L. I.) 9
Gurdon (Lady Camilla) 26
Gurnhill (J.) 18
Gwilt (J.) 31

Haggard (H. Rider) 11, 26, 27, 38
Hake (O.) 14
Halliwell-Phillipps (J.) 10
Hamilton (Col. H. B.) 5
Hamlin (A. D. F.) 36
Harding (S. B.) 5
Harmsworth (A. C.) 13, 14
Harte (Bret) 27
Harting (J. E.) 15
Hartwig (G.) 30
Hassall (A.) 8
Haweis (H. R.) 9, 36
Head (Mrs.) 37
Heath (D. D.) 17
Heathcote (J. M.) 14
—— (C. G.) 14
—— (N.) 11
Helmholtz (Hermann von) 30
Henderson (Lieut-Col. G. F. R.) 9
Henry (W.) 14
Henty (G. A.) 32
Herbert (Col. Kenney) 15
Higgins (Mrs. N.) 9
Hill (Mabel) 5
Hillier (G. Lacy) 13
Hime (H. W. L.) 22
Hodgson (Shadworth) 18
Hoenig (F.) 38
Hogan (J. F.) 9
Holmes (R. R.) 10
Homer 22
Hope (Anthony) 27
Horace 22
Houston (D. F.) 5
Howard (Lady Mabel) 27
Howitt (W.) 11
Hudson (W. H.) 30
Huish (M. B.) 37
Hullah (J.) 37
Hume (David) 18
—— (M. A. S.) 3
Hunt (Rev. W.) 6
Hunter (Sir W.) 6
Hutchinson (Horace G.) 13, 16, 27, 38

Ingelow (Jean) 23
Ingram (T. D.) 6

James (W.) 18, 21
Jameson (Mrs. Anna) 37
Jefferies (Richard) 38
Jekyll (Gertrude) 38
Jerome (Jerome K.) 27
Johnson (J. & J. H.) 39
Jones (H. Bence) 31
Joyce (P. W.) 6, 27, 39
Justinian 18

Kant (I.) 18
Kaye (Sir J. W.) 6
Keary (C. F.) 23
Kelly (E.) 18
Kent (C. B. R.) 6
Kerr (Rev. J.) 14
Kielmansegge (F.) 9
Killick (Rev. A. H.) 18
Kitchin (Dr. G. W.) 6
Knight (E. F.) 11, 14
Köstlin (J.) 10
Kristeller (P.) 37

Ladd (G. T.) 18
Lang (Andrew) 6, 14, 16, 21, 22, 23, 27, 32, 39
Lapsley (G. T.) 5
Lascelles (Hon. G.) 13, 15
Laurie (S. S.) 6
Lawley (Hon. F.) 14
Lawrence (F. W.) 20
Lear (H. L. Sidney) 36
Lecky (W. E. H.) 6, 18, 23
Lees (J. A.) 12
Leighton (J. A.) 21
Leslie (T. E. Cliffe) 20
Lieven (Princess) 10
Lillie (A.) 16
Lindley (J.) 31
Locock (C. D.) 16
Lodge (H. C.) 6
Loftie (Rev. W. J.) 6
Longman (C. J.) 12, 16
—— (F. W.) 16
—— (G. H.) 12, 15
—— (Mrs. C. J.) 37
Lowell (A. L.) 6
Lucian 22
Lutoslawski (W.) 18
Lyall (Edna) 27, 32
Lynch (G.) 6
—— (H. F. B.) 12
Lyttelton (Hon. R. H.) 13
—— (Hon. A.) 14
Lytton (Earl of) 24

Macaulay (Lord) 6, 7, 10, 24
Macdonald (Dr. G.) 24
Macfarren (Sir G. A.) 37
Mackail (J. W.) 10
Mackenzie (C. G.) 16
Mackinnon (J.) 7
Macleod (H. D.) 20
Macpherson (Rev. H. A.) 15
Madden (D. H.) 16
Magnusson (E.) 28
Maher (Rev. M.) 19
Mallet (B.) 7
Malleson (Col. G. B.) 6
Marchment (A. W.) 27
Marshman (J. C.) 9
Maryon (M.) 39
Mason (A. E. W.) 27
Maskelyne (J. N.) 16
Matthews (B.) 39
Maunder (S.) 31
Max Müller (F.) 10, 18, 20, 21, 22, 27, 39
May (Sir T. Erskine) 7
McFerran (J.) 14
Meade (L. T.) 32
Mecredy (R. J.) 13
Melville (G. J. Whyte) 27
Merivale (Dean) 7
Merriman (H. S.) 27
Mill (John Stuart) 18, 20
Millias (J. G.) 16, 30
Milner (G.) 40
Mitchell (E. B.) 13
Monck (W. H. S.) 19
Montague (F. C.) 7
Moore (T.) 31
—— (Rev. Edward) 17
Morgan (C. Lloyd) 21
Morris (Mowbray) 13
——(W.) 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 37, 40
Mulhall (M. G.) 20
Murray (Hilda) 33

Nansen (F.) 12
Nash (V.) 7
Nesbit (E.) 24
Nettleship (R. L.) 17
Newman (Cardinal) 28
Nichols (F. M.) 9

Oakesmith (J.) 22
Ogilvie (R.) 22
Oldfield (Hon. Mrs.) 9
Onslow (Earl of) 14
Osbourne (L.) 28

Packard (A. S.) 21
Paget (Sir J.) 10
Park (W.) 16
Parker (B.) 40
Payne-Gallwey (Sir R.) 14, 16
Pearse (H. H. S.) 6
Pearson (C. H.) 10
Peek (Hedley) 14
Pemberton (W. S. Childe-) 9
Pembroke (Earl of) 14
Pennant (C. D.) 15
Penrose (H. H.) 33
Phillipps-Wolley (C.) 12, 28
Pierce (A. H.) 19
Pitman (C. M.) 14
Pleydell-Bouverie (E. O.) 14
Pole (W.) 17
Pollock (W. H.) 13, 40
Poole (W. H. and Mrs.) 36
Poore (G. V.) 40
Pope (W. H.) 15
Powell (E.) 7
Powys (Mrs. P. L.) 10
Praeger (S. Rosamond) 33
Prevost (C.) 13
Pritchett (R. T.) 14
Proctor (R. A.) 17, 30

Raine (Rev. James) 6
Ramal (W.) 24
Randolph (C. F.) 7
Rankin (R.) 8, 25
Ransome (Cyril) 3, 8
Reid (S. J.) 9
Rhoades (J.) 23
Rice (S. P.) 12
Rich (A.) 23
Richardson (C.) 13, 15
Richmond (Ennis) 19
Rickaby (Rev. John) 19
—— (Rev. Joseph) 19
Ridley (Lady Alice) 28
Riley (J. W.) 24
Roberts (E. P.) 33
Robertson (W. G.) 37
Roget (Peter M.) 20, 31
Rolls (Hon. C. S.) 13
Romanes (G. J.) 10, 19, 21, 24
—— (Mrs. G. J.) 10
Ronalds (A.) 17
Roosevelt (T.) 6
Ross (Martin) 28
Rossetti (Maria Francesca) 40
Rotheram (M. A.) 36
Rowe (R. P. P.) 14
Russell (Lady) 10

Saintsbury (G.) 15
Salomons (Sir D.) 13
Sandars (T. C.) 18
Sanders (E. K.) 9
Savage-Armstrong (G. F.) 25
Scott (F. J.) 37
Scott-Montagu (Hon. J.) 13
Seebohm (F.) 8, 10
Selous (F. C.) 12, 17
Senior (W.) 14, 15
Seth-Smith (C. E.) 14
Seton-Karr 8
Sewell (Elizabeth M.) 28
Shadwell (A.) 40
Shakespeare 25
Shand (A. I.) 15
Shaw (W. A.) 8
Shearman (M.) 12, 13
Sheehan (P. A.) 28
Sheppard (E.) 8
Sinclair (A.) 14
Skrine (F. H.) 9
Smith (C. Fell) 10
—— (R. Bosworth) 8
—— (T. C.) 5
Smith (W. P. Haskett) 12
Somerville (E.) 28
Sophocles 23
Soulsby (Lucy H.) 40
Southey (R.) 40
Spedding (J.) 9, 17
Spender (A. E.) 12
Stanley (Bishop) 31
Stebbing (W.) 28
Steel (A. G.) 13
Stephen (Leslie) 12
Stephens (H. Morse) 8
Sternberg (Count Adalbert) 8
Stevens (R. W.) 40
Stevenson (R. L.) 25, 28, 33
Storr (F.) 17
Stuart-Wortley (A. J.) 15
Stubbs (J. W.) 8
—— (W.) 8
Suffolk & Berkshire (Earl of) 14
Sullivan (Sir E.) 14
Sully (James) 19
Sutherland (A. and G.) 8
—— (Alex.) 19, 40
—— (G.) 40
Suttner (B. von) 29
Swan (M.) 29
Swinburne (A. J.) 19
Symes (J. E.) 20

Tait (J.) 7
Tallentyre (S. G.) 10
Tappan (E. M.) 33
Taylor (Col. Meadows) 8
Tebbutt (C. G.) 14
Terry (C. S.) 10
Thomas (J. W.) 19
Thomson (H. C.)
Thornhill (W. J.) 23
Thornton (T. H.) 10
Thuillier (H. F.) 40
Todd (A.) 8
Tout (T. F.) 7
Toynbee (A.) 20
Trevelyan (Sir G. O.) 6, 7, 8, 9, 10
—— (G. M.) 7, 8
Trollope (Anthony) 29
Turner (H. G.) 40
Tyndall (J.) 9, 12
Tyrrell (R. Y.) 22, 23

Unwin (R.) 40
Upton (F. K. and Bertha) 33

Van Dyke (J. C.) 37
Vanderpoel (E. N.) 37
'Veritas' 5
Virgil 23

Wagner (R.) 25
Wakeman (H. O.) 8
Walford (L. B.) 29
Wallas (Graham) 10
—— (Mrs. Graham) 32
Walpole (Sir Spencer) 8, 10
—— (Horace) 10
Walrond (Col. H.) 12
Walsingham (Lord) 14
Ward (Mrs. W.) 29
Warwick (Countess of) 40
Watson (A. E. T.) 14
—— (G. L.) 14
Weathers (J.) 40
Webb (Mr. and Mrs. Sidney) 20
—— (Judge T.) 40
—— (T. E.) 19
Weber (A.) 19
Weir (Capt. R.) 14
Wellington (Duchess of) 37
Wemyss (M. C. E.) 33
Weyman (Stanley) 29
Whately (Archbishop) 17, 19
Whitelaw (R.) 23
Whittall (Sir J. W.) 40
Wilkins (G.) 23
—— (W. H.) 3
Willard (A. R.) 12
Willich (C. M.) 31
Witham (T. M.) 14
Wood (Rev. J. G.) 31
Wood-Martin (W. G.) 22
Wyatt (A. J.) 24
Wylie (J. H.) 8

Yeats (S. Levett) 29
Yoxall (J. H.) 29

Zeller (E.) 19

History, Politics, Polity, Political Memoirs, &c.

Abbott.—*A History of Greece.* By Evelyn Abbott, M.A., LL.D.

Part I.—From the Earliest Times to the Ionian Revolt. Crown 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.*

Part II.—500-445 B.C. Crown 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.*

Part III.—From the Peace of 445 B.C. to the Fall of the Thirty at Athens in 403 B.C. Crown 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.*

Abbott.—*Tommy Cornstalk:* being Some Account of the Less Notable Features of the South African War from the Point of View of the Australian Ranks. By J. H. M. Abbott. Crown 8vo., 5*s.* net.

Acland and Ransome.—*A Handbook in Outline of the Political History of England to* 1896. Chronologically Arranged. By the Right Hon. A. H. Dyke Acland, and Cyril Ransome, M.A. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

Allgood. — *China War,* 1860: *Letters and Journals.* By Major-General G. Allgood, C.B., formerly Lieut. G. Allgood, 1st Division China Field Force. With Maps, Plans, and Illustrations. Demy 4to. 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

Annual Register (The). A Review of Public Events at Home and Abroad, for the year 1901. 8vo., 18*s.*

Volumes of the *Annual Register* for the years 1863-1900 can still be had. 18*s.* each.

Arnold.—*Introductory Lectures on Modern History.* By Thomas Arnold, D.D., formerly Head Master of Rugby School. 8vo., 7*s.* 6*d.*

Ashbourne.—*Pitt: Some Chapters on His Life and Times.* By the Right Hon. Edward Gibson, Lord Ashbourne, Lord Chancellor of Ireland. With 11 Portraits. 8vo., gilt top, 21*s.*

Ashley.—*Surveys, Historic and Economic:* a Volume of Essays. By W. J. Ashley, M.A. 8vo., 9*s.* net.

Bagwell.—*Ireland under the Tudors.* By Richard Bagwell, LL.D. (3 vols.) Vols. I. and II. From the first invasion of the Northmen to the year 1578. 8vo., 32*s.* Vol. III. 1578-1603. 8vo., 18*s.*

Baillie.—*The Oriental Club, and Hanover Square.* By Alexander F. Baillie. With 6 Photogravure Portraits and 8 Full-page Illustrations. Crown 4to., 25*s.* net.

Besant.—*The History of London.* By Sir Walter Besant. With 74 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 1*s.* 9*d.* Or bound as a School Prize Book, gilt edges, 2*s.* 6*d.*

Bright.—*A History of England.* By the Rev. J. Franck Bright, D.D.

Period I. *Mediæval Monarchy:* A.D. 449-1485. Crown 8vo., 4*s.* 6*d.*

Period II. *Personal Monarchy.* 1485-1688. Crown 8vo., 5*s.*

Period III. *Constitutional Monarchy.* 1689-1837. Crown 8vo., 7*s.* 6*d.*

Period IV. *The Growth of Democracy.* 1837-1880. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

Bruce.—*The Forward Policy and its Results*; or, Thirty-five Years' Work amongst the Tribes on our North-Western Frontier of India. By Richard Isaac Bruce, C.I.E. With 28 Illustrations and a Map. 8vo., 15*s.* net.

Buckle.—*History of Civilisation in England.* By Henry Thomas Buckle.

Cabinet Edition. 3 vols. Crown 8vo., 24*s.*

'Silver Library' Edition. 3 vols. Crown 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.*

Burke.—*A History of Spain, From the Earliest Times to the Death of Ferdinand the Catholic.* By Ulick Ralph Burke, M.A. Edited by Martin A. S. Hume. With 6 Maps. 2 vols. Crown 8vo., 16*s.* net.

Caroline, Queen.—*Caroline the Illustrious, Queen-Consort of George II. and sometime Queen Regent:* a Study of Her Life and Time. By W. H. Wilkins, M.A., F.S.A., Author of 'The Love of an Uncrowned Queen'. 2 vols., 8vo., 36*s.*

Chesney.—*Indian Polity:* a View of the System of Administration in India. By General Sir George Chesney, K.C.B. With Map showing all the Administrative Divisions of British India. 8vo., 21*s.*

History, Politics, Polity, Political Memoirs, &c.—*continued.*

Churchill (Winston Spencer, M.P.).

The River War: an Historical Account of the Reconquest of the Soudan. Edited by Colonel F. Rhodes, D.S.O. With 34 Maps and Plans, and 51 Illustrations from Drawings by Angus McNeill. Also with 7 Photogravure Portraits of Generals, etc. 2 vols. Medium 8vo., 36*s.*

New, Revised and Cheaper Edition. In One Volume. With Photogravure Portrait of Viscount Kitchener of Khartoum, and 22 Maps and Plans. 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

The Story of the Malakand Field Force, 1897. With 6 Maps and Plans. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

London to Ladysmith via Pretoria. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

Ian Hamilton's March. With Portrait of Major-General Sir Ian Hamilton, and 10 Maps and Plans. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

Corbett (Julian S.).

Drake and the Tudor Navy, with a History of the Rise of England as a Maritime Power. With Portraits, Illustrations and Maps. 2 vols. Crown 8vo., 16*s.*

The Successors of Drake. With 4 Portraits (2 Photogravures) and 12 Maps and Plans. 8vo., 21*s.*

Creighton (M., D.D., Late Lord Bishop of London).

A History of the Papacy from the Great Schism to the Sack of Rome, 1378-1527. 6 vols. Cr. 8vo., 5*s.* net each.

Queen Elizabeth. With Portrait. Crown 8vo., 5*s.* net.

Historical Essays and Reviews. Edited by Louise Creighton. Crown 8vo., 5*s.* net.

Dale.—*The Principles of English Constitutional History.* By Lucy Dale, late Scholar of Somerville College, Oxford. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

De Tocqueville.—*Democracy in America.* By Alexis de Tocqueville. Translated by Henry Reeve, C.B., D.C.L. 2 vols. Crown 8vo., 16*s.*

Dickinson.—*The Development of Parliament during the Nineteenth Century.* By G. Lowes Dickinson, M.A. 8vo., 7*s.* 6*d.*

Falkiner.—*Studies in Irish History and Biography*, Mainly of the Eighteenth Century. By C. Litton Falkiner. 8vo., 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

Fitzmaurice.—*Charles William Ferdinand, Duke of Brunswick:* an Historical Study. By Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice. With Map and 2 Portraits. 8vo., 6*s.* net.

Froude (James A.).

The History of England, from the Fall of Wolsey to the Defeat of the Spanish Armada. 12 vols. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

The Divorce of Catherine of Aragon. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

The Spanish Story of the Armada, and other Essays. Cr. 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

The English in Ireland in the Eighteenth Century. 3 vols. Cr. 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.*

English Seamen in the Sixteenth Century.

Cabinet Edition. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

Illustrated Edition. With 5 Photogravure Plates and 16 other Illustrations. Large Cr. 8vo., gilt top, 6*s.* net.

'Silver Library' Edition. Cr. 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

The Council of Trent. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Short Studies on Great Subjects.

Cabinet Edition. 4 vols. 24*s.*

'Silver Library' Edition. 4 vols. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

Cæsar: a Sketch. Cr. 8vo, 3*s.* 6*d.*

Selections from the Writings of James Anthony Froude. Edited by P. S. Allen, M.A. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

History, Politics, Polity, Political Memoirs, &c.—*continued.*

Fuller.—*Egypt and the Hinterland.* By Frederic W. Fuller. With Frontispiece and Map of Egypt and the Sudan. 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Gardiner (Samuel Rawson, D.C.L., LL.D.).

History of England, from the Accession of James I. to the Outbreak of the Civil War, 1603-1642. 10 vols. Crown 8vo., 5*s.* net each.

A History of the Great Civil War, 1642-1649. 4 vols. Cr. 8vo., 5*s.* net each.

A History of the Commonwealth and the Protectorate. 1649-1660. Vol. I. 1649-1651. With 14 Maps. 8vo., 21*s.* Vol. II. 1651-1654. With 7 Maps. 8vo., 21*s.* Vol. III. 1654-1656. With 6 Maps. 8vo., 21*s.*

The Student's History of England. With 378 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., gilt top, 12*s.*

Also in Three Volumes, price 4*s.* each.

What Gunpowder Plot Was. With 8 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 5*s.*

Cromwell's Place in History. Founded on Six Lectures delivered in the University of Oxford. Cr. 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Oliver Cromwell. With Frontispiece. Crown 8vo., 5s. net.

German Empire (The) of To-day: Outlines of its Formation and Development. By 'Veritas'. Crown 8vo., 6*s.* net.

Graham.—*Roman Africa:* an Outline of the History of the Roman Occupation of North Africa, based chiefly upon Inscriptions and Monumental Remains in that Country. By Alexander Graham, F.S.A., F.R.I.B.A. With 30 reproductions of Original Drawings by the Author, and 2 Maps. 8vo., 16*s.* net.

Greville.—*A Journal of the Reigns of King George IV., King William IV., and Queen Victoria.* By Charles C. F. Greville, formerly Clerk of the Council. 8 vols. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

Gross.—*The Sources and Literature of English History, from the Earliest Times to about* 1485. By Charles Gross, Ph.D. 8vo., 18*s.* net.

Hamilton.—*Historical Record of the 14th (King's) Hussars*, from A.D. 1715 to A.D. 1900. By Colonel Henry Blackburne Hamilton, M.A., Christ Church, Oxford; late Commanding the Regiment. With 15 Coloured Plates, 35 Portraits, etc., in Photogravure, and 10 Maps and Plans. Crown 4to., gilt edges, 42*s.* net.

HARVARD HISTORICAL STUDIES.

The Suppression of the African Slave Trade to the United States of America, 1638-1870. By W. E. B. Du Bois, Ph.D. 8vo., 7*s.* 6*d.*

The Contest over the Ratificaton of the Federal Constitution in Massachusetts. By S. B. Harding, A.M. 8vo., 6*s.*

A Critical Study of Nullification in South Carolina. By D. F. Houston, A.M. 8vo., 6*s.*

Nominations for Elective Office in the United States. By Frederick W. Dallinger, A.M. 8vo., 7*s.* 6*d.*

A Bibliography of British Municipal History, including Gilds and Parliamentary Representation. By Charles Gross, Ph.D. 8vo., 12*s.*

The Liberty and Free Soil Parties in the North West. By Theodore C. Smith, Ph.D. 8vo, 7*s.* 6*d.*

The Provincial Governor in the English Colonies of North America. By Evarts Boutell Greene. 8vo., 7*s.* 6*d*

The County Palatine of Durham: a Study in Constitutional History. By Gaillard Thomas Lapsley, Ph.D. 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.*

The Anglican Episcopate and the American Colonies. By Arthur Lyon Cross, Ph.D., Instructor in History in the University of Michigan. 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d*,

---

Hill.—*Liberty Documents.* With Contemporary Exposition and Critical Comments drawn from various Writers. Selected and Prepared by Mabel Hill. Edited with an Introduction by Albert Bushnell Hart, Ph.D. Large Crown 8vo., 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

History, Politics, Polity, Political Memoirs, &c.—*continued.*

Historic Towns.—Edited by E. A. FREEMAN, D.C.L., and Rev. WILLIAM HUNT, M.A. With Maps and Plans. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

Bristol. By Rev. W. Hunt.
Carlisle. By Mandell Creighton, D.D.
Cinque Ports. By Montagu Burrows.
Colchester. By Rev. E. L. Cutts.
Exeter. By E. A. Freeman.
London. By Rev. W. J. Loftie.
Oxford. By Rev. C. W. Boase.
Winchester. By G. W. Kitchin, D.D.
York. By Rev. James Raine.
New York. By Theodore Roosevelt.
Boston (U.S.) By Henry Cabot Lodge.

Hunter.—*A History of British India.* By Sir WILLIAM WILSON HUNTER, K.C.S.I., M.A., LL.D. Vol. I.—Introductory to the Overthrow of the English in the Spice Archipelago, 1623. With 4 Maps. 8vo., 18*s.* Vol. II.—To the Union of the Old and New Companies under the Earl of Godolphin's Award, 1708. 8vo., 16*s.*

Ingram.—*A Critical Examination of Irish History.* From the Elizabethan Conquest to the Legislative Union of 1800. By T. DUNBAR INGRAM, LL.D. 2 vols. 8vo., 24*s.*

Joyce.—*A Short History of Ireland,* from the Earliest Times to 1603. By P. W. JOYCE, LL.D. Crown 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.*

Kaye and Malleson.—*History of the Indian Mutiny,* 1857-1858. By Sir JOHN W. KAYE and Colonel G. B. MALLESON. With Analytical Index and Maps and Plans. 6 vols. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

Kent.—*The English Radicals:* an Historical Sketch. By C. B. ROYLANCE KENT. Crown 8vo., 7*s.* 6*d.*

Lang (ANDREW).

The Mystery of Mary Stuart. With 6 Photogravure Plates (4 Portraits) and 15 other Illustrations. 8vo., 18*s.* net.

James the Sixth and the Gowrie Mystery. With Gowrie's Coat of Arms in colour, 2 Photogravure Portraits and other Illustrations. 8vo., 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

Laurie.—*Historical Survey of Pre-Christian Education.* By S. S. LAURIE, A.M., LL.D. Crown 8vo., 7*s.* 6*d.*

Lecky (The Rt. Hon. WILLIAM E. H.)

History of England in the Eighteenth Century.

Library Edition. 8 vols. 8vo. Vols. I. and II., 1700-1760, 36*s.*; Vols. III. and IV., 1760-1784, 36*s.*; Vols. V. and VI., 1784-1793, 36*s.*; Vols. VII. and VIII., 1793-1800, 36*s.*

Cabinet Edition. ENGLAND. 7 vols. Crown 8vo., 5*s.* net each. IRELAND. 5 vols. Crown 8vo., 5*s.* net each.

History of European Morals from Augustus to Charlemagne. 2 vols. Crown 8vo., 10*s.* net.

History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe. 2 vols. Crown 8vo., 10*s.* net.

Democracy and Liberty.
Library Edition. 2 vols. 8vo., 36*s.*
Cabinet Edition. 2 vols. Cr. 8vo., 10*s.* net.

Lowell.—*Governments and Parties in Continental Europe.* By A. LAWRENCE LOWELL. 2 vols. 8vo., 21*s.*

Lumsden's Horse, Records of.—Edited by H. H. S. PEARSE. With a Map, and numerous Portraits and Illustrations in the Text. 4to.

Lynch.—*The War of the Civilisations: being a Record of 'A Foreign Devil's' Experiences with the Allies in China.* By GEORGE LYNCH, Special Correspondent of the 'Sphere,' etc. With Portrait and 21 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6*s.* net.

Macaulay (Lord).

The Life and Works of Lord Macaulay.

'Edinburgh' Edition. 10 vols. 8vo., 6*s.* each.
Vols. I.-IV. *History of England.*
Vols. V.-VII. *Essays, Biographies, Indian Penal Code, Contributions to Knight's 'Quarterly Magazine'.*
Vol. VIII. *Speeches, Lays of Ancient Rome, Miscellaneous Poems.*
Vols. IX. and X. *The Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay.* By Sir G. O. TREVELYAN, Bart.

History, Politics, Polity, Political Memoirs, &c.—*continued.*

Macaulay (Lord)—*continued.*

The Works.

'Albany' Edition. With 12 Portraits. 12 vols. Large Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

Vols. I.-VI. *History of England, from the Accession of James the Second.*

Vols. VII.-X. *Essays and Biographies.*

Vols. XI.-XII. *Speeches, Lays of Ancient Rome, etc., and Index.*

Cabinet Edition. 16 vols. Post 8vo., £4 16*s.*

Library Edition. 5 vols. 8vo., £4.

History of England from the Accession of James the Second.

Popular Edition. 2 vols. Cr. 8vo., 5*s.*
Student's Edition. 2 vols. Cr. 8vo., 12*s.*
People's Edition. 4 vols. Cr. 8vo., 16*s.*
'Albany' Edition. With 6 Portraits. 6 vols. Large Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.* each.
Cabinet Edition. 8 vols. Post 8vo., 48*s.*
'Edinburgh' Edition. 4 vols. 8vo., 6*s.* each.

Critical and Historical Essays, with Lays of Ancient Rome, etc., in 1 volume.

Popular Edition. Crown 8vo., 2*s.* 6*d.*
'Silver Library' Edition. With Portrait and 4 Illustrations to the 'Lays'. Cr. 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Critical and Historical Essays.

Student's Edition. 1 vol. Cr. 8vo., 6*s.*
People's Edition. 2 vols. Cr. 8vo., 8*s.*
'Trevelyan' Edition. 2 vols. Cr. 8vo., 9*s.*
Cabinet Edition. 4 vols. Post 8vo., 24*s.*
'Edinburgh' Edition. 3 vols. 8vo., 6*s.* each.
Library Edition. 3 vols. 8vo., 36*s.*

Essays, which may be had separately, sewed, 6*d.* each; cloth, 1*s.* each.

Addison and Walpole.
Croker's Boswell's Johnson.
Hallam's Constitutional History.
Warren Hastings.
The Earl of Chatham (Two Essays).
Frederick the Great.
Ranke and Gladstone.
Lord Bacon.
Lord Clive.
Lord Byron, and The Comic Dramatists of the Restoration.

Miscellaneous Writings, Speeches and Poems.

Popular Edition. Crown 8vo., 2*s.* 6*d.*
Cabinet Edition. 4 vols. Post 8vo., 24*s.*

Selections from the Writings of Lord Macaulay. Edited, with Occasional Notes, by the Right Hon. Sir G. O. Trevelyan, Bart. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

Mackinnon (James, Ph.D.).

The History of Edward the Third. 8vo., 18*s.*

The Growth and Decline of the French Monarchy. 8vo., 21*s.* net.

Mallet.—*Mallet du Pan and the French Revolution.* By Bernard Mallet. With Photogravure Portrait. 8vo., 12*s.* 6*d.*

May.—*The Constitutional History of England* since the Accession of George III. 1760-1870. By Sir Thomas Erskine May, K.C.B. (Lord Farnborough). 3 vols. Cr. 8vo., 18*s.*

Merivale (Charles, D.D.).

History of the Romans under the Empire. 8 vols. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

The Fall of the Roman Republic: a Short History of the Last Century of the Commonwealth. 12mo., 7*s.* 6*d.*

General History of Rome, from the Foundation of the City to the Fall of Augustulus, B.C. 753-A.D. 476. With 5 Maps. Crown 8vo., 7*s.* 6*d.*

Montague.—*The Elements of English Constitutional History.* By F. C. Montague, M.A. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Nash.—*The Great Famine and its Causes.* By Vaughan Nash. With 8 Illustrations from Photographs by the Author, and a Map of India showing the Famine Area. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

Owens College Essays.—Edited by T. F. Tout, M.A., Professor of History in the Owens College, Victoria University, and James Tait, M.A., Assistant Lecturer in History. With 4 Maps. 8vo., 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

Powell and Trevelyan.—*The Peasants' Rising and the Lollards:* a Collection of Unpublished Documents. Edited by Edgar Powell and G. M. Trevelyan. 8vo., 6*s.* net.

Randolph.—*The Law and Policy of Annexation,* with Special Reference to the Philippines; together with Observations on the Status of Cuba. By Carman F Randolph. 8vo., 9*s.* net.

History, Politics, Polity, Political Memoirs, &c.—*continued.*

Rankin (Reginald).

The Marquis d'Argenson; and Richard the Second. 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

A Subaltern's Letters to His Wife. (The Boer War.) Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Ransome.—*The Rise of Constitutional Government in England.* By Cyril Ransome, M.A. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

Seebohm (Frederic, LL.D., F.S.A.).

The English Village Community. With 13 Maps and Plates. 8vo., 16*s.*

Tribal Custom in Anglo-Saxon Law: being an Essay supplemental to (1) 'The English Village Community,' (2) 'The Tribal System in Wales'. 8vo., 16*s.*

Seton-Karr.—*The Call to Arms,* 1900-1901; or a Review of the Imperial Yeomanry Movement, and some subjects connected therewith. By Henry Seton-Karr, M.P. With a Frontispiece by R. Caton-Woodville. Crown 8vo., 5*s.* net.

Shaw.—*A History of the English Church during the Civil Wars and under the Commonwealth,* 1640-1660. By William A. Shaw, Litt.D. 2 vols. 8vo., 36*s.*

Sheppard. — *The Old Royal Palace of Whitehall.* By Edgar Sheppard, D.D., Sub-Dean of H.M. Chapels Royal, Sub-Almoner to the King. With 6 Photogravure Plates and 33 other Illustrations. Medium 8vo., 21*s.* net.

Smith.—*Carthage and the Carthaginians.* By R. Bosworth Smith, M.A. With Maps, Plans, etc. Cr. 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Stephens. — *A History of the French Revolution.* By H. Morse Stephens. 8vo. Vols. I. and II. 18*s.* each.

Sternberg. — *My Experiences of the Boer War.* By Adalbert Count Sternberg. With Preface by Lieut.-Col. G. F. R. Henderson. Crown 8vo., 5*s.* net.

Stubbs.—*History of the University of Dublin.* By J. W. Stubbs. 8vo., 12*s.* 6*d.*

Stubbs. — *Historical Introductions to the 'Rolls Series'.* By William Stubbs, D.D., formerly Bishop of Oxford, Regius Professor of Modern History in the University. Collected and Edited by Arthur Hassall, M.A. 8vo., 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

Sutherland.—*The History of Australia and New Zealand,* from 1606-1900. By Alexander Sutherland, M.A., and George Sutherland, M.A. Crown 8vo., 2*s.* 6*d.*

Taylor.—*A Student's Manual of the History of India.* By Colonel Meadows Taylor, C.S.I., etc. Cr. 8vo., 7*s.* 6*d.*

Thomson.—*China and the Powers:* a Narrative of the Outbreak of 1900. By H. C. Thomson. With 2 Maps and 29 Illustrations. 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Todd. — *Parliamentary Government in the British Colonies.* By Alpheus Todd, LL.D. 8vo., 30*s.* net.

Trevelyan.—*The American Revolution.* Part I. 1766-1776. By Sir G. O. Trevelyan, Bart. 8vo., 16*s.*

Trevelyan.—*England in the Age of Wycliffe.* By George Macaulay Trevelyan. 8vo., 15*s.*

Wakeman and Hassall.—*Essays Introductory to the Study of English Constitutional History.* Edited by Henry Offley Wakeman, M.A., and Arthur Hassall, M.A. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

Walpole.—*History of England from the Conclusion of the Great War in* 1815 *to* 1858. By Sir Spencer Walpole, K.C.B. 6 vols. Cr. 8vo., 6*s.* each.

Wylie (James Hamilton, M.A.).

History of England under Henry IV. 4 vols. Crown 8vo. Vol. I., 1399-1404, 10*s.* 6*d.* Vol. II., 1405-1406, 15*s.* (*out of print*). Vol. III., 1407-1411, 15*s.* Vol. IV., 1411-1413, 21*s.*

The Council of Constance to the Death of John Hus. Cr. 8vo., 6*s.* net.

Biography, Personal Memoirs, &c.

Bacon.—*The Letters and Life of Francis Bacon, including all his Occasional Works.* Edited by James Spedding. 7 vols. 8vo., £4 4s.

Bagehot.—*Biographical Studies.* By Walter Bagehot. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Bernards (The) of Abington and Nether Winchendon: A Family History. By Mrs. Napier Higgins. 2 Vols. 8vo.

Blount. — *The Memoirs of Sir Edward Blount, K.C.B., etc.* Edited by Stuart J. Reid, Author of 'The Life and Times of Sydney Smith,' etc. With 3 Photogravure Plates. 8vo., 10s. 6d. net.

Bowen.—*Edward Bowen: a Memoir.* By the Rev. the Hon. W. E. Bowen. With Appendices, 3 Photogravure Portraits and 2 other Illustrations. 8vo., 12s. 6d. net.

Carlyle.—*Thomas Carlyle:* A History of his Life. By James Anthony Froude.

1795-1835. 2 vols. Crown 8vo., 7s.
1834-1881. 2 vols. Crown 8vo., 7s.

Crozier.—*My Inner Life:* being a Chapter in Personal Evolution and Autobiography. By John Beattie Crozier, LL.D. 8vo., 14s.

Dante.—*The Life and Works of Dante Allighieri:* being an Introduction to the Study of the 'Divina Commedia'. By the Rev. J. F. Hogan, D.D. With Portrait. 8vo., 12s. 6d.

Danton.—*Life of Danton.* By A. H. Beesly. With Portraits. Cr. 8vo., 6s.

De Bode.—*The Baroness de Bode,* 1775-1803. By William S. Childe-Pemberton. With 4 Photogravure Portraits and other Illustrations. 8vo., gilt top, 12s. 6d. net.

Erasmus.

Life and Letters of Erasmus. By James Anthony Froude. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

The Epistles of Erasmus, from his Earliest Letters to his Fifty-first Year, arranged in Order of Time. English Translations, with a Commentary. By Francis Morgan Nichols. 8vo., 18s. net.

Faraday.—*Faraday as a Discoverer.* By John Tyndall. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Fénelon: his Friends and his Enemies, 1651-1715. By E. K. Sanders. With Portrait. 8vo., 10s. 6d.

Fox.—*The Early History of Charles James Fox.* By the Right Hon. Sir G. O. Trevelyan, Bart. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Froude.—*Hurrell Froude:* Some Reprints and Reprinted Comments. With a Biographical Preface by the Editor, L. I. Guiney. With Illustrations. 8vo.

Granville.—*Some Records of the Later Life of Harriet, Countess Granville.* By her Granddaughter, the Hon. Mrs. Oldfield. With 17 Portraits. 8vo., gilt top, 16s. net.

Grey. — *Memoir of Sir George Grey, Bart, G.C.B.,* 1799-1882. By Mandell Creighton, D.D., late Lord Bishop of London. With 3 Portraits. Crown 8vo., 6s. net.

Hamilton.—*Life of Sir William Hamilton.* By R. P. Graves. 8vo. 3 vols. 15s. each. Addendum. 8vo., 6d. sewed.

Harrow School Register (The), 1801-1900. Second Edition, 1901. Edited by M. G. Dauglish, Barrister-at-Law. 8vo. 15s. net.

Havelock.—*Memoirs of Sir Henry Havelock, K.C.B.* By John Clark Marshman. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Haweis.—*My Musical Life.* By the Rev. H. R. Haweis. With Portrait of Richard Wagner and 3 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 6s. net.

Hunter.—*The Life of Sir William Wilson Hunter, K.C.S.I., M.A., LL.D.* Author of 'A History of British India,' etc. By Francis Henry Skrine, F.S.S. With 6 Portraits (2 Photogravures) and 4 other Illustrations. 8vo., 16s. net.

Jackson.—*Stonewall Jackson and the American Civil War.* By Lieut.-Col. G. F. R. Henderson. With 2 Portraits and 33 Maps and Plans. 2 vols. Cr. 8vo., 16s. net.

Kielmansegge.—*Diary of a Journey to England in the Years* 1761-1762. By Count Frederick Kielmansegge. With 4 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 5s. net.

Biography, Personal Memoirs, &c.—*continued.*

Leslie.—*The Life and Campaigns of Alexander Leslie, First Earl of Leven.* By Charles Sanford Terry, M.A. With Maps and Plans. 8vo., 16s.

Lieven.—*Letters of Dorothea, Princess Lieven, during her Residence in London,* 1812-1834. Edited by Lionel G. Robinson. With 2 Photogravure Portraits. 8vo., 14s. net.

Luther.—*Life of Luther.* By Julius Köstlin. With 62 Illustrations and 4 Facsimilies of MSS. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Macaulay.—*The Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay.* By the Right Hon. Sir G. O. Trevelyan, Bart.

Popular Edition. 1 vol. Cr. 8vo., 2s. 6d.
Student's Edition 1 vol. Cr. 8vo., 6s.
Cabinet Edition. 2 vols. Post 8vo., 12s.
'Edinburgh' Edition. 2 vols. 8vo., 6s. each.
Library Edition. 2 vols. 8vo., 36s.

Max Müller (F.)

The Life and Letters of the Right Hon. Friedrich Max Müller. Edited by his Wife. With Photogravure Portraits and other Illustrations. 2 vols., 8vo.

My Autobiography: a Fragment. With 6 Portraits. 8vo., 12s. 6d.

Auld Lang Syne. Second Series. 8vo., 10s. 6d.

Chips from a German Workshop. Vol. II. Biographical Essays. Cr. 8vo., 5s.

Meade.—*General Sir Richard Meade and the Feudatory States of Central and Southern India.* By Thomas Henry Thornton. With Portrait, Map and Illustrations. 8vo., 10s. 6d. net.

Morris.—*The Life of William Morris.* By J. W. Mackail. With 2 Portraits and 8 other Illustrations by E. H. New, etc. 2 vols. Large Crown 8vo., 10s. net.

On the Banks of the Seine. By A. M. F., Authoress of 'Foreign Courts and Foreign Homes'. Crown 8vo., 6s.

Paget.—*Memoirs and Letters of Sir James Paget.* Edited by Stephen Paget, one of his sons. With 6 Portraits (3 Photogravures) and 4 other Illustrations. 8vo., 12s. 6d. net.

Place.—*The Life of Francis Place,* 1771-1854. By Graham Wallas, M.A. With 2 Portraits. 8vo., 12s.

Powys.—*Passages from the Diaries of Mrs. Philip Lybbe Powys, of Hardwick House, Oxon.* 1756-1808. Edited by Emily J. Climenson. 8vo., gilt top, 16s.

Râmakrishna: *His Life and Sayings.* By the Right Hon. F. Max Müller. Crown 8vo., 5s.

Rich.—*Mary Rich, Countess of Warwick* (1625-1678): Her Family and Friends. By C. Fell Smith. With 7 Photogravure Portraits and 9 other Illustrations. 8vo., gilt top, 18s. net.

Rochester, and other Literary Rakes of the Court of Charles II., with some Account of their Surroundings. By the Author of 'The Life of Sir Kenelm Digby,' The Life of a Prig,' etc. With 15 Portraits. 8vo., 16s.

Romanes.—*The Life and Letters of George John Romanes, M.A., LL.D F.R.S.* Written and Edited by his Wife. With Portrait and 2 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 5s. net.

Russell.—*Swallowfield and its Owners.* By Constance Lady Russell, of Swallowfield Park. With 15 Photogravure Portraits and 36 other Illustrations. 4to., gilt edges, 42s. net.

Seebohm.—*The Oxford Reformers—John Colet, Erasmus, and Thomas More:* a History of their Fellow-Work. By Frederic Seebohm. 8vo., 14s.

Shakespeare.—*Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare.* By J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps. With Illustrations and Facsimiles. 2 vols. Royal 8vo., 21s.

Tales of my Father.—By A. M. F., Author of 'Foreign Courts and Foreign Homes,' and 'On the Banks of the Seine'. Crown 8vo., 6s.

Tallentyre.—*The Women of the Salons,* and other French Portraits. By S. G. Tallentyre. With 11 Photogravure Portraits. 8vo., 10s. 6d. net.

Victoria, Queen, 1819-1901. By Richard R. Holmes, M.V.O., F.S.A., Librarian to the Queen. With Photogravure Portrait. Crown 8vo., gilt top, 5s. net.

Walpole.—*Some Unpublished Letters of Horace Walpole.* Edited by Sir Spencer Walpole, K.C.B. With 2 Portraits. Crown 8vo., 4s. 6d. net.

Wellington.—*Life of the Duke of Wellington.* By the Rev. G. R. Gleig, M.A. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Travel and Adventure, the Colonies, &c.

Arnold.—*Seas and Lands.* By Sir Edwin Arnold. With 71 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Baker (Sir S. W.).

Eight Years in Ceylon. With 6 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

The Rifle and the Hound in Ceylon. With 6 Illusts. Cr. 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Ball (John).

The Alpine Guide. Reconstructed and Revised on behalf of the Alpine Club, by W. A. B. Coolidge.

Vol. I., *The Western Alps:* the Alpine Region, South of the Rhone Valley, from the Col de Tenda to the Simplon Pass. With 9 New and Revised Maps. Crown 8vo., 12*s.* net.

Hints and Notes, Practical and Scientific, for Travellers in the Alps: being a Revision of the General Introduction to the 'Alpine Guide'. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* net.

Bent.—*The Ruined Cities of Mashonaland:* being a Record of Excavation and Exploration in 1891. By J. Theodore Bent. With 117 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Brassey (The Late Lady).

A Voyage in the 'Sunbeam'; Our Home on the Ocean for Eleven Months.

Cabinet Edition. With Map and 66 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., gilt edges, 7*s.* 6*d.*

'Silver Library' Edition. With 66 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Popular Edition. With 60 Illustrations. 4to., 6*d.* sewed, 1*s.* cloth.

School Edition. With 37 Illustrations. Fcp., 2*s.* cloth, or 3*s.* white parchment.

Sunshine and Storm in the East.

Popular Edition. With 103 Illustrations. 4to., 6*d.* sewed, 1*s.* cloth.

In the Trades, the Tropics, and the 'Roaring Forties'.

Cabinet Edition. With Map and 220 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., gilt edges, 7*s.* 6*d.*

Crawford.—*South American Sketches.* By Robert Crawford, M.A. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

Fountain (Paul).

The Great Deserts and Forests of North America. With a Preface by W. H. Hudson, Author of 'The Naturalist in La Plata,' etc. 8vo., 9*s.* 6*d.* net.

The Great Mountains and Forests of South America. With Portrait and 7 Illustrations. 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Froude (James A.).

Oceana: or England and her Colonies. With 9 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

The English in the West Indies: or, the Bow of Ulysses. With 9 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 2*s.* boards, 2*s.* 6*d.* cloth.

Grove.—*Seventy-one Days' Camping in Morocco.* By Lady Grove. With Photogravure Portrait and 32 Illustrations from Photographs. 8vo., 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Haggard.—*A Winter Pilgrimage:* Being an Account of Travels through Palestine, Italy and the Island of Cyprus, undertaken in the year 1900. By H. Rider Haggard. With 31 Illustrations from Photographs. Cr. 8vo., gilt top, 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

Heathcote.—*St. Kilda.* By Norman Heathcote. With 80 Illustrations from Sketches and Photographs of the People, Scenery and Birds by the Author. 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Howitt.—*Visits to Remarkable Places.* Old Halls, Battle-Fields, Scenes, illustrative of Striking Passages in English History and Poetry. By William Howitt. With 80 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Knight (E. F.).

With the Royal Tour: a Narrative of the Recent Tour of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York through Greater Britain. With 16 Illustrations and a Map. Crown 8vo., 5*s.* net.

The Cruise of the 'Alerte': the Narrative of a Search for Treasure on the Desert Island of Trinidad. With 2 Maps and 23 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Where Three Empires Meet: a Narrative of Recent Travel in Kashmir, Western Tibet, Baltistan, Ladak, Gilgit, and the adjoining Countries. With a Map and 54 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

The 'Falcon' on the Baltic: a Voyage from London to Copenhagen in a Three-Tonner. With 10 Full-page Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Travel and Adventure, the Colonies, &c.—*continued.*

Lees.—*Peaks and Pines:* another Norway Book. By J. A. Lees. With 63 Illustrations and Photographs. Cr. 8vo., 6*s.*

Lees and Clutterbuck.—B.C. 1887: *A Ramble in British Columbia.* By J. A. Lees and W. J. Clutterbuck. With Map and 75 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Lynch.—*Armenia:* Travels and Studies. By H. F. B. Lynch. With 197 Illustrations (some in tints) reproduced from Photographs and Sketches by the Author, 16 Maps and Plans, a Bibliography, and a Map of Armenia and adjacent countries. 2 vols. Medium 8vo., gilt top, 42*s.* net.

Nansen.—*The First Crossing of Greenland.* By Fridtjof Nansen. With 143 Illustrations and a Map. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Rice.—*Occasional Essays on Native South Indian Life.* By Stanley P. Rice, Indian Civil Service. 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.*

Smith.—*Climbing in the British Isles.* By W. P. Haskett Smith. With Illustrations and Numerous Plans.

Part I. *England.* 16mo., 3*s.* net.

Part II. *Wales and Ireland.* 16mo., 3*s.* net.

Spender.—*Two Winters in Norway:* being an Account of Two Holidays spent on Snow-shoes and in Sleigh Driving, and including an Expedition to the Lapps. By A. Edmund Spender. With 40 Illustrations from Photographs. 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Stephen.—*The Play-Ground of Europe* (The Alps). By Sir Leslie Stephen, K.C.B. With 4 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Three in Norway. By Two of Them. With a Map and 59 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 2*s.* boards, 2*s.* 6*d.* cloth.

Tyndall.—(John).

The Glaciers of the Alps. With 61 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

Hours of Exercise in the Alps. With 7 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

Willard.—*The Land of the Latins.* By Ashton R. Willard. With 11 Illustrations from Photographs. Crown 8vo., 5*s.* net.

Sport and Pastime.

THE BADMINTON LIBRARY.

Edited by HIS GRACE THE (EIGHTH) DUKE OF BEAUFORT, K.G., and A. E. T. WATSON.

ARCHERY. By C. J. Longman and Col. H. Walrond. With Contributions by Miss Legh, Viscount Dillon, etc. With 2 Maps, 23 Plates and 172 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., cloth, 6*s.* net; half-bound, with gilt top, 9*s.* net.

ATHLETICS. By Montague Shearman. With Chapters on Athletics at School by W. Beacher Thomas; Athletic Sports in America by C. H. Sherrill; a Contribution on Paper-chasing by W. Rye, and an Introduction by Sir Richard Webster (Lord Alverstone). With 12 Plates and 37 Illustrations in the Text. Cr. 8vo., cloth, 6*s.* net; half-bound, with gilt top, 9*s.* net.

BIG GAME SHOOTING. By Clive Phillipps-Wolley.

Vol. I. AFRICA AND AMERICA. With Contributions by Sir Samuel W. Baker, W. C. Oswell, F. C. Selous, etc. With 20 Plates and 57 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., cloth, 6*s.* net; half-bound, with gilt top, 9*s.* net.

Vol. II. EUROPE, ASIA, AND THE ARCTIC REGIONS. With Contributions by Lieut.-Colonel R. Heber Percy, Major Algernon C. Heber Percy, etc. With 17 Plates and 56 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., cloth, 6*s.* net; half-bound, with gilt top, 9*s.* net.

Sport and Pastime—*continued.*

THE BADMINTON LIBRARY—*continued.*

Edited by HIS GRACE THE (EIGHTH) DUKE OF BEAUFORT, K.G., and A. E. T. WATSON.

BILLIARDS. By Major W. BROADFOOT, R.E. With Contributions by A. H. BOYD, SYDENHAM DIXON, W. J. FORD, etc. With 11 Plates, 19 Illustrations in the Text, and numerous Diagrams. Crown 8vo., cloth, 6*s.* net; half-bound, with gilt top, 9*s.* net.

COURSING AND FALCONRY. By HARDING COX, CHARLES RICHARDSON, and the Hon. GERALD LASCELLES. With 20 Plates and 55 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., cloth, 6*s.* net; half-bound, with gilt top, 9*s.* net.

CRICKET. By A. G. STEEL and the Hon. R. H. LYTTELTON. With Contributions by ANDREW LANG, W. G. GRACE, F. GALE, etc. With 13 Plates and 52 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., cloth, 6*s.* net; half-bound, with gilt top, 9*s.* net.

CYCLING. By the EARL OF ALBEMARLE and G. LACY HILLIER. With 19 Plates and 44 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., cloth, 6*s.* net; half-bound, with gilt top, 9*s.* net.

DANCING. By Mrs. LILLY GROVE. With Contributions by Miss MIDDLETON, The Hon. Mrs. ARMYTAGE, etc. With Musical Examples, and 38 Full-page Plates and 93 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., cloth, 6*s.* net; half-bound, with gilt top, 9*s.* net.

DRIVING. By His Grace the (Eighth) DUKE of BEAUFORT, K.G. With Contributions by A. E. T. WATSON the EARL OF ONSLOW, etc. With 12 Plates and 54 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., cloth, 6*s.* net; half-bound, with gilt top, 9*s.* net.

FENCING, BOXING, AND WRESTLING. By WALTER H. POLLOCK, F. C. GROVE, C. PREVOST, E. B. MITCHELL, and WALTER ARMSTRONG. With 18 Plates and 24 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., cloth, 6*s.* net; half-bound, with gilt top, 9*s.* net.

FISHING. By H. CHOLMONDELEY-PENNELL.

Vol. I. SALMON AND TROUT. With Contributions by H. R. FRANCIS, Major JOHN P. TRAHERNE, etc. With 9 Plates and numerous Illustrations of Tackle, etc. Crown 8vo., cloth, 6*s.* net; half-bound, with gilt top, 9*s.* net.

Vol. II. PIKE AND OTHER COARSE FISH. With Contributions by the MARQUIS OF EXETER, WILLIAM SENIOR, G. CHRISTOPHER DAVIS, etc. With 7 Plates and numerous Illustrations of Tackle, etc. Crown 8vo., cloth, 6*s.* net; half-bound, with gilt top, 9*s.* net.

FOOTBALL. *HISTORY*, by MONTAGUE SHEARMAN; *THE ASSOCIATION GAME*, by W. J. OAKLEY and G. O. SMITH; *THE RUGBY UNION GAME*, by FRANK MITCHELL. With other Contributions by R. E. MACNAGHTEN, M. C. KEMP, J. E. VINCENT, WALTER CAMP and A. SUTHERLAND. With 19 Plates and 35 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., cloth, 6*s.* net; half-bound, with gilt top, 9*s.* net.

GOLF. By HORACE G. HUTCHINSON. With Contributions by the Rt. Hon. A. J. BALFOUR, M.P., Sir WALTER SIMPSON, Bart., ANDREW LANG, etc. With 34 Plates and 56 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., cloth, 6*s.* net; half-bound, with gilt top, 9*s.* net.

HUNTING. By His Grace the (Eighth) DUKE OF BEAUFORT, K.G., and MOWBRAY MORRIS. With Contributions by the EARL OF SUFFOLK AND BERKSHIRE, Rev. E. W. L. DAVIES, G. H. LONGMAN, etc. With 5 Plates and 54 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., cloth, 6*s.* net; half-bound, with gilt top, 9*s.* net.

MOTORS AND MOTOR-DRIVING. By ALFRED C. HARMSWORTH, the MARQUIS DE CHASSELOUP-LAUBAT, the Hon. JOHN SCOTT-MONTAGU, R. J. MECREDY, the Hon. C. S. ROLLS, Sir DAVID SALOMONS, Bart., etc. With 13 Plates and 136 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., cloth, 9*s.* net; half-bound, 12*s.* net.

A Cloth Box for use when Motoring, 2*s.* net

Sport and Pastime—*continued.*

THE BADMINTON LIBRARY—*continued.*

Edited by HIS GRACE THE (EIGHTH) DUKE OF BEAUFORT, K.G., and A. E. T. WATSON.

MOUNTAINEERING. By C. T. DENT. With Contributions by the Right Hon. J. BRYCE, M.P., Sir MARTIN CONWAY, D. W. FRESHFIELD, C. E. MATTHEWS, etc. With 13 Plates and 91 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., cloth, 6*s.* net; half-bound, with gilt top, 9*s.* net.

POETRY OF SPORT (THE).—Selected by HEDLEY PEEK. With a Chapter on Classical Allusions to Sport by ANDREW LANG, and a Special Preface to the BADMINTON LIBRARY by A. E. T. WATSON. With 32 Plates and 74 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., cloth, 6*s.* net; half-bound, with gilt top, 9*s.* net.

RACING AND STEEPLE-CHASING. By the EARL OF SUFFOLK AND BERKSHIRE, W. G. CRAVEN, the Hon. F. LAWLEY, ARTHUR COVENTRY, and A. E. T. WATSON. With Frontispiece and 56 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., cloth, 6*s.* net; half-bound, with gilt top, 9*s.* net.

RIDING AND POLO. By Captain ROBERT WEIR, J. MORAY BROWN, T. F. DALE, THE LATE DUKE OF BEAUFORT, THE EARL OF SUFFOLK AND BERKSHIRE, etc. With 18 Plates and 41 Illusts. in the Text. Crown 8vo., cloth, 6*s.* net; half-bound, with gilt top, 9*s.* net.

ROWING. By R. P. P. ROWE and C. M. PITMAN. With Chapters on Steering by C. P. SEROCOLD and F. C. BEGG; Metropolitan Rowing by S. LE BLANC SMITH; and on PUNTING by P. W. SQUIRE. With 75 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., cloth, 6*s.* net; half-bound, with gilt top, 9*s.* net.

SHOOTING.

Vol. I. FIELD AND COVERT. By LORD WALSINGHAM and Sir RALPH PAYNE-GALLWEY, Bart. With Contributions by the Hon. GERALD LASCELLES and A. J. STUART-WORTLEY. With 11 Plates and 95 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., cloth, 6*s.* net; half-bound, with gilt top, 9*s.* net.

Vol. II. MOOR AND MARSH. By LORD WALSINGHAM and Sir RALPH PAYNE-GALLWEY, Bart. With Contributions by LORD LOVAT and Lord CHARLES LENNOX KERR. With 8 Plates and 57 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., cloth, 6*s.* net; half-bound, with gilt top, 9*s.* net.

SEA FISHING. By JOHN BICKERDYKE, Sir H. W. GORE-BOOTH, ALFRED C. HARMSWORTH, and W. SENIOR. With 22 Full-page Plates and 175 Illusts. in the Text. Crown 8vo., cloth, 6*s.* net; half-bound, with gilt top, 9*s.* net.

SKATING, CURLING, TOBOGGANING. By J. M. HEATHCOTE, C. G. TEBBUTT, T. MAXWELL WITHAM, Rev. JOHN KERR, ORMOND HAKE, HENRY A. BUCK, etc. With 12 Plates and 272 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., cloth, 6*s.* net; half-bound, with gilt top, 9*s.* net.

SWIMMING. By ARCHIBALD SINCLAIR and WILLIAM HENRY, Hon. Secs. of the Life-Saving Society. With 13 Plates and 112 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., cloth, 6*s.* net; half-bound, with gilt top, 9*s.* net.

TENNIS, LAWN TENNIS, RACKETS AND FIVES. By J. M. and C. G. HEATHCOTE, E. O. PLEYDELL-BOUVERIE, and A. C. AINGER. With Contributions by the Hon. A. LYTTELTON, W. C. MARSHALL, Miss L. DOD, etc. With 12 Plates and 67 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., cloth, 6*s.* net; half-bound, with gilt top, 9*s.* net.

YACHTING.

Vol. I. CRUISING, CONSTRUCTION OF YACHTS, YACHT RACING RULES, FITTING-OUT, etc. By Sir EDWARD SULLIVAN, Bart., THE EARL OF PEMBROKE, LORD BRASSEY, K.C.B., C. E. SETH-SMITH, C.B., G. L. WATSON, R. T. PRITCHETT, E. F. KNIGHT, etc. With 21 Plates and 93 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., cloth, 6*s.* net; half-bound, with gilt top, 9*s.* net.

Vol. II. YACHT CLUBS, YACHTING IN AMERICA AND THE COLONIES, YACHT RACING, etc. By R. T. PRITCHETT, THE MARQUIS OF DUFFERIN AND AVA, K.P., THE EARL OF ONSLOW, JAMES MCFERRAN, etc. With 35 Plates and 160 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., cloth, 9*s.* net; half-bound, with gilt top, 9*s.* net.

Sport and Pastime—*continued.*

FUR, FEATHER, AND FIN SERIES.

Edited by A. E. T. Watson.

Crown 8vo., price 5*s.* each Volume, cloth.

*** *The Volumes are also issued half-bound in Leather, with gilt top. Price 7s. 6d. net each.*

THE PARTRIDGE. Natural History, by the Rev. H. A. Macpherson; Shooting, by A. J. Stuart-Wortley; Cookery, by George Saintsbury. With 11 Illustrations and various Diagrams. Crown 8vo., 5*s.*

THE GROUSE. Natural History, by the Rev. H. A. Macpherson; Shooting, by A. J. Stuart-Wortley; Cookery, by George Saintsbury. With 13 Illustrations and various Diagrams. Crown 8vo., 5*s.*

THE PHEASANT. Natural History, by the Rev. H. A. Macpherson; Shooting, by A. J. Stuart-Wortley; Cookery, by Alexander Innes Shand. With 10 Illustrations and various Diagrams. Crown 8vo., 5*s.*

THE HARE. Natural History, by the Rev. H. A. Macpherson; Shooting, by the Hon. Gerald Lascelles; Coursing, by Charles Richardson; Hunting, by J. S. Gibbons and G. H. Longman; Cookery, by Col. Kenney Herbert. With 9 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 5*s.*

RED DEER.—Natural History, by the Rev. H. A. Macpherson; Deer Stalking, by Cameron of Lochiel; Stag Hunting, by Viscount Ebrington; Cookery, by Alexander Innes Shand. With 10 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 5*s.*

THE SALMON. By the Hon. A. E. Gathorne-Hardy. With Chapters on the Law of Salmon Fishing by Claud Douglas Pennant; Cookery, by Alexander Innes Shand. With 8 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 5*s.*

THE TROUT. By the Marquess of Granby. With Chapters on the Breeding of Trout by Col. H. Custance; and Cookery, by Alexander Innes Shand. With 12 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 5*s.*

THE RABBIT. By James Edmund Harting. Cookery, by Alexander Innes Shand. With 10 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 5*s.*

PIKE AND PERCH. By William Senior ('Redspinner,' Editor of the 'Field'). With Chapters by John Bickerdyke and W. H. Pope; Cookery, by Alexander Innes Shand. With 12 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 5*s.*

Alverstone and Alcock.—*Surrey Cricket:* its History and Associations. Edited by the Right Hon. Lord Alverstone, L.C.J., President, and C.W. Alcock, Secretary, of the Surrey County Cricket Club. With 48 Illustrations. 18vo., 16*s.* net.

Bickerdyke.—*Days of My Life on Water, Fresh and Salt;* and other Papers. By John Bickerdyke. With Photo-etching Frontispiece and 8 Full-page Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Blackburne.—*Mr. Blackburne's Games at Chess.* Selected, Annotated and Arranged by Himself. Edited, with a Biographical Sketch and a brief History of Blindfold Chess, by P. Anderson Graham. With Portrait of Mr. Blackburne. 8vo., 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Dead Shot (The): or, Sportsman's Complete Guide. Being a Treatise on the Use of the Gun, with Rudimentary and Finishing Lessons in the Art of Shooting Game of all kinds. Also Game-driving, Wildfowl and Pigeon-shooting, Dog-breaking, etc. By Marksman. With numerous Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.*

Ellis.—*Chess Sparks;* or, Short and Bright Games of Chess. Collected and Arranged by J. H. Ellis, M.A. 8vo., 4*s.* 6*d.*

Folkard.—*The Wild-Fowler:* A Treatise on Fowling, Ancient and Modern, descriptive also of Decoys and Flight-ponds, Wild-fowl Shooting, Gunning-punts, Shooting-yachts, etc. Also Fowling in the Fens and in Foreign Countries, Rock-fowling, etc., etc., by H. C. Folkard. With 13 Engravings on Steel, and several Woodcuts. 8vo., 12*s.* 6*d.*

Sport and Pastime—*continued.*

Ford.—*The Theory and Practice of Archery.* By Horace Ford. New Edition, thoroughly Revised and Re-written by W. Butt, M.A. With a Preface by C. J. Longman, M.A. 8vo., 14*s.*

Francis.—*A Book on Angling:* or, Treatise on the Art of Fishing in every Branch; including full Illustrated List of Salmon Flies. By Francis Francis. With Portrait and Coloured Plates. Crown 8vo., 15*s.*

Fremantle.—*The Book of the Rifle.* By the Hon. T. F. Fremantle, V.D., Major, 1st Bucks V.R.C. With 54 Plates and 107 Diagrams in the Text. 8vo., 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

Gathorne-Hardy.—*Autumns in Argyleshire with Rod and Gun.* By the Hon. A. E. Gathorne-Hardy. With 8 Photogravure Illustrations by Archibald Thorburn. 8vo., 6*s.* net.

Graham.—*Country Pastimes for Boys.* By P. Anderson Graham. With 252 Illustrations from Drawings and Photographs. Cr. 8vo., gilt edges, 3*s.* net.

Hutchinson.—*The Book of Golf and Golfers.* By Horace G. Hutchinson. With Contributions by Miss Amy Pascoe, H. H. Hilton, J. H. Taylor, H J. Whigham, and Messrs. Sutton & Sons. With 71 Portraits from Photographs. Large crown 8vo., gilt top, 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Lang.—*Angling Sketches.* By Andrew Lang. With 20 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Lillie.—*Croquet up to Date.* Containing the Ideas and Teachings of the Leading Players and Champions. By Arthur Lillie. With Contributions by Lieut.-Col. the Hon. H. Needham, C. D. Locock, etc. With 19 Illustrations (15 Portraits), and numerous Diagrams. 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Locock.—*Side and Screw:* being Notes on the Theory and Practice of the Game of Billiards. By C. D. Locock. With Diagrams. Crown 8vo., 5*s.* net.

Longman.—*Chess Openings.* By Frederick W. Longman. Fcp. 8vo., 2*s.* 6*d.*

Mackenzie.—*Notes for Hunting Men.* By Captain Cortlandt Gordon Mackenzie. Crown 8vo., 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Madden.—*The Diary of Master William Silence:* a Study of Shakespeare and of Elizabethan Sport. By the Right Hon. D. H. Madden, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Dublin. 8vo., gilt top, 16*s.*

Maskelyne.—*Sharps and Flats:* a Complete Revelation of the Secrets of Cheating at Games of Chance and Skill. By John Nevil Maskelyne, of the Egyptian Hall. With 62 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

Millais (John Guille).

The Wild-Fowler in Scotland. With a Frontispiece in Photogravure by Sir J. E. Millais, Bart., P.R.A., 8 Photogravure Plates, 2 Coloured Plates and 50 Illustrations from the Author's Drawings and from Photographs. Royal 4to., gilt top, 30*s.* net.

The Natural History of the British Surface-Feeding Ducks. With 6 Photogravures and 66 Plates (41 in Colours) from Drawings by the Author, Archibald Thorburn, and from Photographs. Royal 4to., cloth, gilt top, £6 6*s.* net.

Modern Bridge.—By 'Slam'. With a Reprint of the Laws of Bridge, as adopted by the Portland and Turf Clubs. 18mo., gilt edges, 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Park.—*The Game of Golf.* By William Park, Jun., Champion Golfer, 1887-89. With 17 Plates and 26 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., 7*s.* 6*d.*

Payne-Gallwey (Sir Ralph, Bart.).

The Cross-Bow: its History, Construction and Management. With numerous Illustrations. Medium 4to.

Letters to Young Shooters (First Series). On the Choice and use of a Gun. With 41 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 7*s.* 6*d.*

Letters to Young Shooters (Second Series). On the Production, Preservation, and Killing of Game. With Directions in Shooting Wood-Pigeons and Breaking-in Retrievers. With Portrait and 103 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 12*s.* 6*d.*

Letters to Young Shooters. (Third Series.) Comprising a Short Natural History of the Wildfowl that are Rare or Common to the British Islands, with complete directions in Shooting Wildfowl on the Coast and Inland. With 200 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 18*s.*

Sport and Pastime—*continued.*

Pole.—*The Theory of the Modern Scientific Game of Whist.* By William Pole, F.R.S. Fcp. 8vo., gilt edges, 2*s.* net.

Proctor.—*How to Play Whist: with the Laws and Etiquette of Whist.* By Richard A. Proctor. Crown 8vo., gilt edges, 3*s.* net.

Ronalds.—*The Fly-Fisher's Entomology.* By Alfred Ronalds. With 20 coloured Plates. 8vo., 14*s.*

Selous.—*Sport and Travel, East and West.* By Frederick Courteney Selous. With 18 Plates and 35 Illustrations in the Text. Medium 8vo., 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

Mental, Moral, and Political Philosophy.

LOGIC, RHETORIC, PSYCHOLOGY, &c.

Abbott.—*The Elements of Logic.* By T. K. Abbott, B.D. 12mo., 3*s.*

Aristotle.

The Ethics: Greek Text, Illustrated with Essay and Notes. By Sir Alexander Grant, Bart. 2 vols. 8vo., 32*s.*

An Introduction to Aristotle's Ethics. Books I.-IV. (Book X. c. vi.-ix. in an Appendix). With a continuous Analysis and Notes. By the Rev. E. Moore, D.D. Crown 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.*

Bacon (Francis).

Complete Works. Edited by R. L. Ellis, James Spedding and D. D. Heath. 7 vols. 8vo., £3 13*s.* 6*d.*

Letters and Life, including all his occasional Works. Edited by James Spedding. 7 vols. 8vo., £4 4*s.*

The Essays: with Annotations. By Richard Whately, D.D. 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.*

The Essays: with Notes. By F. Storr and C. H. Gibson. Cr. 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

The Essays: with Introduction, Notes, and Index. By E. A. Abbott, D.D. 2 Vols. Fcp. 8vo., 6*s.* The Text and Index only, without Introduction and Notes, in One Volume. Fcp. 8vo., 2*s.* 6*d.*

Bain (Alexander).

Mental and Moral Science: a Compendium of Psychology and Ethics. Crown 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.*

Or separately,

Part I. *Psychology and History of Philosophy.* Crown 8vo., 6*s.* 6*d.*

Part II. *Theory of Ethics and Ethical Systems.* Crown 8vo., 4*s.* 6*d.*

Bain (Alexander)—*continued.*

Logic. Part I. *Deduction.* Cr. 8vo., 4*s.* Part II. *Induction.* Cr. 8vo., 6*s.* 6*d.*

The Senses and the Intellect. 8vo., 15*s.*

The Emotions and the Will. 8vo., 15*s.*

Practical Essays. Cr. 8vo., 2*s.*

Brooks.—*The Elements of Mind:* being an Examination into the Nature of the First Division of the Elementary Substances of Life. By H. Jamyn Brooks. 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Crozier (John Beattie).

Civilisation and Progress: being the Outlines of a New System of Political, Religious and Social Philosophy. 8vo., 14*s.*

History of Intellectual Development: on the Lines of Modern Evolution.

Vol. I. 8vo., 14*s.*

Vol. II. (*In preparation.*)

Vol. III. 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.*

Davidson.—*The Logic of Definition,* Explained and Applied. By William L. Davidson, M.A. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

Green (Thomas Hill).—The Works of. Edited by R. L. Nettleship.

Vols. I. and II. Philosophical Works. 8vo. 16*s.* each.

Vol. III. Miscellanies. With Index to the three Volumes, and Memoir. 8vo., 21*s.*

Lectures on the Principles of Political Obligation. With Preface by Bernard Bosanquet. 8vo., 5*s.*

Mental, Moral and Political Philosophy—*continued.*

LOGIC, RHETORIC, PSYCHOLOGY, &C.

Gurnhill.—*The Morals of Suicide.* By the Rev. J. Gurnhill, B.A. Vol. I., Crown 8vo., 6*s.* Vol. II., Crown 8vo.

Hodgson (Shadworth H.).

Time and Space: A Metaphysical Essay. 8vo., 16*s.*

The Theory of Practice: an Ethical Inquiry. 2 vols. 8vo., 24*s.*

The Philosophy of Reflection. 2 vols. 8vo., 21*s.*

The Metaphysic of Experience. Book I. General Analysis of Experience; Book II. Positive Science; Book III. Analysis of Conscious Action; Book IV. The Real Universe. 4 vols. 8vo., 36*s.* net.

Hume.—*The Philosophical Works of David Hume.* Edited by T. H. Green and T. H. Grose. 4 vols. 8vo., 28*s.* Or separately, Essays. 2 vols. 14*s.* Treatise of Human Nature. 2 vols. 14*s.*

James (William, M.D., LL.D.).

The Will to Believe, and Other Essays in Popular Philosophy. Crown 8vo., 7*s.* 6*d.*

The Varieties of Religious Experience: a Study in Human Nature. Being the Gifford Lectures on Natural Religion delivered at Edinburgh in 1901-1902. 8vo., 12*s.* net.

Justinian.—*The Institutes of Justinian:* Latin Text, chiefly that of Huschke, with English Introduction, Translation, Notes, and Summary. By Thomas C. Sandars, M.A. 8vo., 18*s.*

Kant (Immanuel).

Critique of Practical Reason, and Other Works on the Theory of Ethics. Translated by T. K. Abbott, B.D. With Memoir. 8vo., 12*s.* 6*d.*

Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysic of Ethics. Translated by T. K. Abbott, B.D. Crown 8vo, 3*s.*

Introduction to Logic, and his Essay on the Mistaken Subtilty of the Four Figures. Translated by T. K. Abbott. 8vo., 6*s*

Kelly.—*Government or Human Evolution.* By Edmond Kelly, M.A., F.G.S. Vol. I. Justice. Crown 8vo., 7*s.* 6*d.* net. Vol. II. Collectivism and Individualism. Crown 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Killick.—*Handbook to Mill's System of Logic.* By Rev. A. H. Killick, M.A. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Ladd (George Trumbull).

Philosophy of Conduct: a Treatise of the Facts, Principles and Ideals of Ethics. 8vo., 21*s.*

Elements of Physiological Psychology. 8vo., 21*s.*

Outlines of Descriptive Psychology: a Text-Book of Mental Science for Colleges and Normal Schools. 8vo., 12*s.*

Outlines of Physiological Psychology. 8vo., 12*s.*

Primer of Psychology. Cr. 8vo., 5*s.* 6*d.*

Lecky.—*The Map of Life:* Conduct and Character. By William Edward Hartpole Lecky.

Library Edition, 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.*

Cabinet Edition, Cr. 8vo., 5*s.* net.

Lutoslawski.—*The Origin and Growth of Plato's Logic.* With an Account of Plato's Style and of the Chronology of his Writings. By Wincenty Lutoslawski. 8vo., 21*s.*

Max Müller (F.).

The Science of Thought. 8vo., 21*s.*

The Six Systems of Indian Philosophy. 8vo., 18*s.*

Three Lectures on the Vedanta Philosophy. Crown 8vo., 5*s.*

Mill (John Stuart).

A System of Logic. Cr. 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

On Liberty. Crown 8vo., 1*s.* 4*d.*

Considerations on Representative Government. Crown 8vo., 2*s.*

Utilitarianism. 8vo., 2*s.* 6*d.*

Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy. 8vo., 16*s.*

Nature, the Utility of Religion, and Theism. Three Essays. 8vo., 5*s.*

Mental, Moral, and Political Philosophy—*continued.*

LOGIC, RHETORIC, PSYCHOLOGY, &c.

Monck. — *An Introduction to Logic.* By William Henry S. Monck, M.A. Crown 8vo., 5*s.*

Pierce.—*Studies in Auditory and Visual Space Perception:* Essays on Experimental Psychology. By A. H. Pierce. Crown 8vo., 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

Richmond.—*The Mind of a Child.* By Ennis Richmond. Cr. 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Romanes.—*Mind and Motion and Monism.* By George John Romanes, Cr. 8vo., 4*s.* 6*d.*

Sully (James).

An Essay on Laughter: its Forms, its Cause, its Development and its Value. 8vo.. 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

The Human Mind: a Text-book of Psychology. 2 vols. 8vo., 21*s.*

Outlines of Psychology. Crown 8vo., 9*s.*

The Teacher's Handbook of Psychology. Crown 8vo., 6*s.* 6*d.*

Studies of Childhood. 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.*

Children's Ways: being Selections from the Author's 'Studies of Childhood'. With 25 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 4*s.* 6*d.*

Sutherland. — *The Origin and Growth of the Moral Instinct.* By Alexander Sutherland, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo., 28*s.*

Swinburne. — *Picture Logic:* an Attempt to Popularise the Science of Reasoning. By Alfred James Swinburne, M.A. With 23 Woodcuts. Cr. 8vo., 2*s.* 6*d.*

Thomas. — *Intuitive Suggestion.* By J. W. Thomas, Author of 'Spiritual Law in the Natural World,' etc. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Webb.—*The Veil of Isis:* a Series of Essays on Idealism. By Thomas E. Webb, LL.D., Q.C. 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.*

Weber.—*History of Philosophy.* By Alfred Weber, Professor in the University of Strasburg. Translated by Frank Thilly, Ph.D. 8vo., 16*s.*

Whately (Archbishop).

Bacon's Essays. With Annotations. 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.*

Elements of Logic. Cr. 8vo., 4*s.* 6*d.*

Elements of Rhetoric. Cr. 8vo., 4*s.* 6*d.*

Zeller (Dr. Edward).

The Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics. Translated by the Rev. O. J. Reichel, M.A. Crown 8vo., 15*s.*

Outlines of the History of Greek Philosophy. Translated by Sarah F. Alleyne and Evelyn Abbott, M.A., LL.D. Crown 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.*

Plato and the Older Academy. Translated by Sarah F. Alleyne and Alfred Goodwin, B.A. Crown 8vo., 18*s.*

Socrates and the Socratic Schools. Translated by the Rev. O. J. Reichel, M.A. Crown 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.*

Aristotle and the Earlier Peripatetics. Translated by B. F. C. Costelloe, M.A., and J. H. Muirhead, M.A. 2 vols. Crown 8vo., 24*s.*

STONYHURST PHILOSOPHICAL SERIES.

A Manual of Political Economy. By C. S. Devas, M.A. Crown 8vo., 7*s.* 6*d.*

First Principles of Knowledge. By John Rickaby, S.J. Crown 8vo., 5*s.*

General Metaphysics. By John Rickaby, S.J. Crown 8vo., 5*s.*

Logic. By Richard F. Clarke, S.J. Crown 8vo., 5*s.*

Moral Philosophy (Ethics and Natural Law). By Joseph Rickaby, S.J. Crown 8vo., 5*s.*

Natural Theology. By Bernard Boedder, S.J. Crown 8vo., 6*s.* 6*d.*

Psychology. By Michael Maher, S.J., D.Litt., M.A. (Lond.). Cr. 8vo., 6*s.* 6*d.*

History and Science of Language, &c.

Davidson.—*Leading and Important English Words:* Explained and Exemplified. By William L. Davidson, M.A. Fcp. 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Farrar.—*Language and Languages.* By F. W. Farrar, D.D., Dean of Canterbury. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

Graham.—*English Synonyms,* Classified and Explained: with Practical Exercises. By G. F. Graham. Fcp. 8vo., 6*s.*

Max Müller (F.).

The Science of Language. 2 vols. Crown 8vo., 10*s.*

Max Müller (F.)—*continued.*

Biographies of Words, and the Home of the Aryas. Crown 8vo., 5*s.*

Chips from a German Workshop. Vol. III. *Essays on Language and Literature.* Crown 8vo., 5*s.*

Last Essays. First Series. Essays on Language, Folk-lore and other Subjects. Crown 8vo., 5*s.*

Roget.—*Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases.* Classified and Arranged so as to Facilitate the Expression of Ideas and assist in Literary Composition. By Peter Mark Roget, M.D., F.R.S. With full Index. Crown 8vo., 9*s.* net.

Political Economy and Economics.

Ashley (W. J.).

English Economic History and Theory. Crown 8vo., Part I., 5*s.* Part II., 10*s.* 6*d.*

Surveys, Historic and Economic. Crown 8vo., 9*s.* net.

Bagehot.—*Economic Studies.* By Walter Bagehot. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Barnett.—*Practicable Socialism:* Essays on Social Reform. By Samuel A. and Henrietta Barnett. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

Devas.—*A Manual of Political Economy.* By C. S. Devas, M.A. Cr. 8vo., 7*s.* 6*d.* (*Stonyhurst Philosophical Series.*)

Lawrence.—*Local Variations in Wages.* By F. W. Lawrence, M.A. With Index and 18 Maps and Diagrams. 4to., 8*s.* 6*d.*

Leslie.—*Essays on Political Economy.* By T. E. Cliffe Leslie, Hon. LL.D., Dubl. 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.*

Macleod (Henry Dunning).

Bimetallism. 8vo., 5*s.* net.

The Elements of Banking. Cr. 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

The Theory and Practice of Banking. Vol. I. 8vo., 12*s.* Vol. II. 14*s.*

Macleod (Henry Dunning)—*contd.*

The Theory of Credit. 8vo. In 1 Vol., 30*s.* net; or separately, Vol. I., 10*s.* net. Vol. II., Part I., 10*s.* net. Vol II., Part II. 10*s.* net.

Indian Currency. 8vo., 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Mill.—*Political Economy.* By John Stuart Mill. *Popular Edition.* Cr. 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.* *Library Edition.* 2 vols. 8vo., 30*s.*

Mulhall.—*Industries and Wealth of Nations.* By Michael G. Mulhall, F.S.S. With 32 Diagrams. Cr. 8vo., 8*s.* 6*d.*

Symes.—*Political Economy:* a Short Text-book of Political Economy. With Problems for Solution, Hints for Supplementary Reading, and a Supplementary Chapter on Socialism. By J. E. Symes, M.A. Crown 8vo., 2*s.* 6*d.*

Toynbee.—*Lectures on the Industrial Revolution of the 18th Century in England.* By Arnold Toynbee. 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.*

Webb (Sidney and Beatrice).

The History of Trade Unionism. With Map and Bibliography. 8vo., 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Industrial Democracy: a Study in Trade Unionism. 2 vols. 8vo., 12*s.* net.

Problems of Modern Industry. 8vo., 5*s.* net.

Evolution, Anthropology, &c.

Avebury.—*The Origin of Civilisation*, and the Primitive Condition of Man. By the Right Hon. Lord Avebury. With 6 Plates and 20 Illustrations. 8vo., 18*s.*

Clodd (Edward).

The Story of Creation: a Plain Account of Evolution. With 77 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

A Primer of Evolution: being a Popular Abridged Edition of 'The Story of Creation'. With Illustrations. Fcp. 8vo., 1*s.* 6*d.*

Packard.—*Lamarck, the Founder of Evolution:* his Life and Work, with Translations of his Writings on Organic Evolution. By Alpheus S. Packard, M.D., LL.D., Professor of Zoology and Geology in Brown University. With 10 Portrait and other Illustrations. Large Crown 8vo., 9*s.* net.

Romanes (George John).

Essays. Edited by C. Lloyd Morgan. Crown 8vo., 5*s.* net.

An Examination of Weismannism. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

Darwin, and after Darwin: an Exposition of the Darwinian Theory, and a Discussion on Post-Darwinian Questions.

Part I. The Darwinian Theory. With Portrait of Darwin and 125 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.*

Part II. Post-Darwinian Questions: Heredity and Utility. With Portrait of the Author and 5 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.*

Part III. Post-Darwinian Questions: Isolation and Physiological Selection. Crown 8vo., 5*s.*

The Science of Religion, &c.

Balfour. — *The Foundations of Belief;* being Notes Introductory to the Study of Theology. By the Right Hon. Arthur James Balfour. Cr. 8vo., 6*s.* net.

Baring-Gould.—*The Origin and Development of Religious Belief.* By the Rev. S. Baring-Gould. 2 vols. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

Campbell.—*Religion in Greek Literature.* By the Rev. Lewis Campbell, M.A., LL.D. 8vo., 15*s.*

Davidson.—*Theism*, as Grounded in Human Nature, Historically and Critically Handled. Being the Burnett Lectures for 1892 and 1893, delivered at Aberdeen. By W. L. Davidson, M.A., LL.D. 8vo., 15*s.*

James.—*The Varieties of Religious Experience:* a Study in Human Nature. Being the Gifford Lectures on Natural Religion delivered at Edinburgh in 1901-1902. By William James, LL.D., etc. 8vo., 12*s.* net.

Lang (Andrew).

Magic and Religion. 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.*

Custom and Myth: Studies of Early Usage and Belief. With 15 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Myth, Ritual, and Religion. 2 vols. Crown 8vo., 7*s.*

Modern Mythology: a Reply to Professor Max Müller. 8vo., 9*s.*

The Making of Religion. Cr. 8vo., 5*s.* net.

Leighton.—*Typical Modern Conceptions of God;* or, The Absolute of German Romantic Idealism and of English Evolutionary Agnosticism. By Joseph Alexander Leighton, Professor of Philosophy in Hobart College, U.S. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Max Müller (The Right Hon. F.).

Chips from a German Workshop. Vol. IV. Essays on Mythology and Folklore. Crown 8vo., 5*s.*

The Six Systems of Indian Philosophy. 8vo., 18*s.*

Contributions to the Science of Mythology. 2 vols. 8vo., 32*s.*

The Origin and Growth of Religion, as illustrated by the Religions of India. The Hibbert Lectures, delivered at the Chapter House, Westminster Abbey, in 1878. Crown 8vo., 5*s.*

Introduction to the Science of Religion: Four Lectures delivered at the Royal Institution. Crown 8vo., 5*s.*

Natural Religion. The Gifford Lectures, delivered before the University of Glasgow in 1888. Crown 8vo., 5*s.*

Physical Religion. The Gifford Lectures, delivered before the University of Glasgow in 1890. Crown 8vo., 5*s.*

The Science of Religion, &c.—*continued.*

Max Müller (The Right Hon. F.)—*continued.*

Anthropological Religion. The Gifford Lectures, delivered before the University of Glasgow in 1891. Cr. 8vo., 5*s.*

Theosophy, or Psychological Religion. The Gifford Lectures, delivered before the University of Glasgow in 1892. Crown 8vo., 5*s.*

Three Lectures on the Vedânta Philosophy, delivered at the Royal Institution in March, 1894. Cr. 8vo., 5*s.*

Last Essays. Second Series—Essays on the Science of Religion. Crown 8vo., 5*s.*

Oakesmith. — *The Religion of Plutarch:* a Pagan Creed of Apostolic Times. An Essay. By John Oakesmith, D.Litt., M.A. Crown 8vo., 5*s.* net.

Wood-Martin (W. G.).

Traces of the Elder Faiths of Ireland: a Folk-lore Sketch. A Handbook of Irish Pre-Christian Traditions. With 192 Illustrations. 2 vols. 8vo., 30*s.* net.

Pagan Ireland: an Archæological Sketch. A Handbook of Irish Pre-Christian Antiquities. With 512 Illustrations. 8vo., 15*s.*

Classical Literature, Translations, &c.

Abbott.—*Hellenica.* A Collection of Essays on Greek Poetry, Philosophy, History, and Religion. Edited by Evelyn Abbott, M.A., LL.D. Crown 8vo., 7*s.* 6*d.*

Æschylus.—*Eumenides of Æschylus.* With Metrical English Translation. By J. F. Davies. 8vo., 7*s.*

Aristophanes. — *The Acharnians of Aristophanes*, translated into English Verse. By R. Y. Tyrrell. Crown 8vo., 1*s.*

Becker (W. A.), Translated by the Rev. F. Metcalfe, B.D.

Gallus: or, Roman Scenes in the Time of Augustus. With Notes and Excursuses. With 26 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Charicles: or, Illustrations of the Private Life of the Ancient Greeks. With Notes and Excursuses. With 26 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Campbell.—*Religion in Greek Literature.* By the Rev. Lewis Campbell, M.A., LL.D., Emeritus Professor of Greek, University of St. Andrews. 8vo., 15*s.*

Cicero.—*Cicero's Correspondence.* By R. Y. Tyrrell. Vols. I., II., III., 8vo., each 12*s.* Vol. IV., 15*s.* Vol. V., 14*s.* Vol. VI., 12*s.* Vol. VII. Index, 7*s.* 6*d.*

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology. Edited by a Committee of the Classical Instructors of Harvard University. Vols. XI., 1900; XII., 1901; XIII., 1902. 8vo., 6*s.* 6*d.* net each.

Hime.—*Lucian, the Syrian Satirist.* By Lieut.-Col. Henry W. L. Hime, (late) Royal Artillery. 8vo., 5*s.* net.

Homer.—*The Odyssey of Homer.* Done into English Verse. By William Morris. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

Horace.—*The Works of Horace, rendered into English Prose.* With Life, Introduction and Notes. By William Coutts, M.A. Crown 8vo., 5*s.* net.

Lang.—*Homer and the Epic.* By Andrew Lang. Crown 8vo., 9*s.* net.

Lucian. — *Translations from Lucian.* By Augusta M. Campbell Davidson, M.A. Edin. Crown 8vo., 5*s.* net.

Ogilvie.—*Horae Latinae:* Studies in Synonyms and Syntax. By the late Robert Ogilvie, M.A., LL.D., H.M. Chief Inspector of Schools for Scotland. Edited by Alexander Souter, M.A. With a Memoir by Joseph Ogilvie, M.A., LL.D. 8vo., 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

Classical Literature, Translations, &c.—*continued.*

Rich.—*A Dictionary of Roman and Greek Antiquities.* By A. Rich, B.A. With 2000 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo., 6*s.* net.

Sophocles.—Translated into English Verse. By Robert Whitelaw, M.A., Assistant Master in Rugby School. Cr. 8vo., 8*s.* 6*d.*

Tyrrell. — *Dublin Translations into Greek and Latin Verse.* Edited by R. Y. Tyrrell. 8vo., 6*s.*

Virgil.

The Poems of Virgil. Translated into English Prose by John Conington. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

The Æneid of Virgil. Translated into English Verse by John Conington. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

Virgil—*continued.*

The Æneids of Virgil. Done into English Verse. By William Morris. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

The Æneid of Virgil, freely translated into English Blank Verse. By W. J. Thornhill. Crown 8vo., 6*s.* net.

The Æneid of Virgil. Translated into English Verse by James Rhoades.
Books I.-VI. Crown 8vo., 5*s.*
Books VII.-XII. Crown 8vo., 5*s.*

The Eclogues and Georgics of Virgil. Translated into English Prose by J. W. Mackail, Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford. 16mo., 5*s.*

Wilkins.—*The Growth of the Homeric Poems.* By G. Wilkins. 8vo., 6*s.*

Poetry and the Drama.

Arnold.—*The Light of the World:* or, The Great Consummation. By Sir Edwin Arnold. With 14 Illustrations after Holman Hunt. Crown 8vo., 5*s.* net.

Bell (Mrs. Hugh).

Chamber Comedies: a Collection of Plays and Monologues for the Drawing Room. Crown 8vo., 5*s.* net.

Fairy Tale Plays, and How to Act Them. With 91 Diagrams and 52 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* net.

Rumpelstiltzkin: a Fairy Play in Five Scenes (Characters, 7 Male; 1 Female). From 'Fairy Tale Plays and How to Act Them'. With Illustrations, Diagrams and Music. Cr. 8vo., sewed, 6*d.*

Bird. — *Ronald's Farewell*, and other Verses. By George Bird, M.A., Vicar of Bradwell, Derbyshire. Fcp. 8vo., 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

Dabney.—*The Musical Basis of Verse:* a Scientific Study of the Principles of Poetic Composition. By J. P. Dabney. Crown 8vo., 6*s.* 6*d.* net.

Ingelow (Jean).

Poetical Works. Complete in One Volume. Crown 8vo., gilt top, 6*s.* net.

Lyrical and other Poems. Selected from the Writings of Jean Ingelow. Fcp. 8vo., 2*s.* 6*d.* cloth plain, 3*s.* cloth gilt.

Keary.—*The Brothers:* a Fairy Masque. By C. F. Keary. Cr. 8vo., 4*s.* net.

Lang (Andrew).

Grass of Parnassus. Fcp. 8vo., 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

The Blue Poetry Book. Edited by Andrew Lang. With 100 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., gilt edges, 6*s.*

Lecky.—*Poems.* By the Right Hon. W. E. H. Lecky. Fcp. 8vo., 5*s.*

Poetry and the Drama—*continued.*

Lytton (The Earl of), (OWEN MEREDITH).

THE WANDERER. Cr. 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.*

LUCILE. Crown 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.*

SELECTED POEMS. Cr. 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.*

Macaulay.—*LAYS OF ANCIENT ROME, WITH 'IVRY' AND 'THE ARMADA'.* By Lord MACAULAY.

Illustrated by G. SCHARF. Fcp. 4to., 10*s.* 6*d.*

———————— Bijou Edition. 18mo., 2*s.* 6*d.* gilt top.

———————— Popular Edition. Fcp. 4to., 6*d.* sewed, 1*s.* cloth.

Illustrated by J. R. WEGUELIN. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* net.

Annotated Edition. Fcp. 8vo., 1*s.* sewed, 1*s.* 6*d.* cloth.

MacDonald.—*A BOOK OF STRIFE, IN THE FORM OF THE DIARY OF AN OLD SOUL:* Poems. By GEORGE MACDONALD, LL.D. 18mo., 6*s.*

Morris (WILLIAM).

POETICAL WORKS—LIBRARY EDITION. Complete in 11 volumes. Crown 8vo., price 5*s.* net each.

THE EARTHLY PARADISE. 4 vols. Crown 8vo., 5*s.* net each.

THE LIFE AND DEATH OF JASON. Crown 8vo., 5*s.* net.

THE DEFENCE OF GUENEVERE, and other Poems. Crown 8vo., 5*s.* net.

THE STORY OF SIGURD THE VOLSUNG, AND THE FALL OF THE NIBLUNGS. Cr. 8vo., 5*s.* net.

POEMS BY THE WAY, AND LOVE IS ENOUGH. Crown 8vo., 5*s.* net.

Morris (WILLIAM)—*continued.*

THE ODYSSEY OF HOMER. Done into English Verse. Crown 8vo., 5*s.* net.

THE ÆNEIDS OF VIRGIL. Done into English Verse. Crown 8vo., 5*s.* net.

THE TALE OF BEOWULF, SOMETIME KING OF THE FOLK OF THE WEDERGEATS. Translated by WILLIAM MORRIS and A. J. WYATT. Crown 8vo., 5*s.* net.

Certain of the POETICAL WORKS may also be had in the following Editions:—

THE EARTHLY PARADISE.

Popular Edition. 5 vols. 12mo., 25*s.*; or 5*s.* each, sold separately.

The same in Ten Parts, 25*s.*; or 2*s.* 6*d.* each, sold separately.

Cheap Edition, in 1 vol. Crown 8vo., 6*s.* net.

POEMS BY THE WAY. Square crown 8vo., 6*s.*

*** For Mr. William Morris's other Works, see pp. 27, 28, 37 and 40.

Morte Arthur: an Alliterative Poem of the Fourteenth Century. Edited from the Thornton MS., with Introduction, Notes and Glossary. By MARY MACLEOD BANKS. Fcp. 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Nesbit.—*LAYS AND LEGENDS.* By E. NESBIT (Mrs. HUBERT BLAND). First Series. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.* Second Series. With Portrait. Crown 8vo., 5*s.*

Ramal.—*SONGS OF CHILDHOOD.* By WALTER RAMAL. With a Frontispiece from a Drawing by RICHARD DOYLE. Fcp. 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Riley.—*OLD FASHIONED ROSES:* Poems. By JAMES WHITCOMB RILEY. 12mo., gilt top, 5*s.*

Romanes.—*A SELECTION FROM THE POEMS OF GEORGE JOHN ROMANES, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S.* With an Introduction by T. HERBERT WARREN, President of Magdalen College, Oxford. Crown 8vo., 4*s.* 6*d.*

Poetry and the Drama—*continued.*

Savage-Armstrong.—*Ballads of Down.* By G. F. Savage-Armstrong, M.A., D.Litt. Crown 8vo., 7*s.* 6*d.*

Shakespeare.

Bowdler's Family Shakespeare. With 36 Woodcuts. 1 vol. 8vo., 14*s.* Or in 6 vols. Fcp. 8vo., 21*s.*

The Shakespeare Birthday Book. By Mary F. Dunbar. 32mo., 1*s.* 6*d.*

Stevenson.—*A Child's Garden of Verses.* By Robert Louis Stevenson. Fcp. 8vo., gilt top, 5*s.*

Wagner.—*The Nibelungen Ring.* Done into English Verse by Reginald Rankin, B.A., of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law.

Vol. I. Rhine Gold, The Valkyrie. Fcp. 8vo., gilt top, 4*s.* 6*d.*

Vol. II. Siegfried, The Twilight of th Gods. Fcp. 8vo., gilt top, 4*s.* 6*d.*

Fiction, Humour, &c.

Anstey (F.).

Voces Populi. (Reprinted from 'Punch'.)

First Series. With 20 Illustrations by J. Bernard Partridge. Cr. 8vo., gilt top, 3*s.* net.

Second Series. With 25 Illustrations by J. Bernard Partridge. Cr. 8vo., gilt top, 3*s.* net.

The Man from Blankley's, and other Sketches. (Reprinted from 'Punch'.) With 25 Illustrations by J. Bernard Partridge. Cr. 8vo., gilt top, 3*s.* net.

Bailey.—*My Lady of Orange:* a Romance of the Netherlands in the Days of Alva. By H. C. Bailey. With 8 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

Beaconsfield (The Earl of).

Novels and Tales. Complete in 11 vols. Crown 8vo., 1*s.* 6*d.* each, or in sets, 11 vols., gilt top, 15*s.* net.

Vivian Grey.	Sybil.
The Young Duke, etc.	Henrietta Temple.
Alroy, Ixion, etc.	Venetia.
Contarini Fleming, etc.	Coningsby.
Tancred.	Lothair.
	Endymion.

Novels and Tales. The Hughenden Edition. With 2 Portraits and 11 Vignettes. 11 vols. Crown 8vo., 42*s.*

Bottome.—*Life, the Interpreter.* By Phyllis Bottome. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

Churchill.—*Savrola:* a Tale of the Revolution in Laurania. By Winston Spencer Churchill, M.P. Cr. 8vo., 6*s.*

Crawford.—*The Autobiography of a Tramp.* By J. H. Crawford. With a Photogravure Frontispiece 'The Vagrants,' by Fred. Walker, and 8 other Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 5*s.* net.

Creed.—*The Vicar of St. Luke's.* By Sibyl Creed. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

Davenport.—*By the Ramparts of Jezreel:* a Romance of Jehu, King of Israel. By Arnold Davenport. With Frontispiece by Lancelot Speed. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

Dougall.—*Beggars All.* By L. Dougall. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Doyle (Sir A. Conan).

Micah Clarke: A Tale of Monmouth's Rebellion. With 10 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

The Refugees: A Tale of the Huguenots. With 25 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

The Stark Munro Letters. Cr. 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

The Captain of the Polestar, and other Tales. Cr. 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Fiction, Humour, &c.—*continued.*

Dyson.—*The Gold-Stealers:* a Story of Waddy. By Edward Dyson, Author of 'Rhymes from the Mines,' etc. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

Farrar (F. W., Dean of Canterbury).

Darkness and Dawn: or, Scenes in the Days of Nero. An Historic Tale. Cr. 8vo., gilt top, 6*s.* net.

Gathering Clouds: a Tale of the Days of St. Chrysostom. Cr. 8vo., gilt top, 6*s.* net.

Fowler (Edith H.).

The Young Pretenders. A Story of Child Life. With 12 Illustrations by Sir Philip Burne-Jones, Bart. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

The Professor's Children. With 24 Illustrations by Ethel Kate Burgess. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

Francis (M. E.).

Fiander's Widow. Cr. 8vo., 6*s.*

Yeoman Fleetwood. With Frontispiece. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* net.

Pastorals of Dorset. With 8 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

The Manor Farm. With Frontispiece by Claud C. du Pré Cooper. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

Froude.—*The Two Chiefs of Dunboy:* an Irish Romance of the Last Century. By James A. Froude. Cr. 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Gurdon.—*Memories and Fancies:* Suffolk Tales and other Stories; Fairy Legends; Poems; Miscellaneous Articles. By the late Lady Camilla Gurdon. Cr. 8vo., 5*s.*

Haggard (H. Rider).

Allan Quatermain. With 31 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Allan's Wife. With 34 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Beatrice. With Frontispiece and Vignette. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Black Heart and White Heart, and other Stories. With 33 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

Cleopatra. With 29 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Colonel Quaritch, V.C. With Frontispiece and Vignette. Cr. 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Dawn. With 16 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Dr. Therne. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Eric Brighteyes. With 51 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Heart of the World. With 15 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Joan Haste. With 20 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Lysbeth. With 26 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

Maiwa's Revenge. Cr. 8vo., 1*s.* 6*d.*

Montezuma's Daughter. With 24 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Mr. Meeson's Will. With 16 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Nada the Lily. With 23 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

She. With 32 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Swallow: a Tale of the Great Trek. With 8 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

The People of the Mist. With 16 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

The Witch's Head. With 16 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Fiction, Humour, &c.—*continued.*

Haggard and Lang.—*The World's Desire.* By H. Rider Haggard and Andrew Lang. With 27 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Harte.—*In the Carquinez Woods.* By Bret Harte. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Hope.—*The Heart of Princess Osra.* By Anthony Hope. With 9 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Howard (Lady Mabel).

The Undoing of John Brewster. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

The Failure of Success. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

Hutchinson.—*A Friend of Nelson.* By Horace G. Hutchinson. Cr. 8vo., 6*s.*

Jerome.—*Sketches in Lavender: Blue and Green.* By Jerome K. Jerome, Author of 'Three Men in a Boat,' etc. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Joyce.—*Old Celtic Romances.* Twelve of the most beautiful of the Ancient Irish Romantic Tales. Translated from the Gaelic. By P. W. Joyce, LL.D. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Lang (Andrew).

A Monk of Fife; a Story of the Days of Joan of Arc. With 13 Illustrations by Selwyn Image. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

The Disentanglers. With 7 Full-page Illustrations by H. J. Ford. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

Lyall (Edna).

The Hinderers. Crown 8vo., 2*s.* 6*d.*

The Autobiography of a Slander. Fcp. 8vo., 1*s.* sewed.

Presentation Edition. With 20 Illustrations by Lancelot Speed. Crown 8vo., 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Doreen. The Story of a Singer. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

Wayfaring Men. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

Hope the Hermit: a Romance of Borrowdale. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

Marchmont.—*In the Name of a Woman:* a Romance. By Arthur W. Marchmont. With 8 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

Mason and Lang.—*Parson Kelly.* By A. E. W. Mason and Andrew Lang. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Max Müller.—*Deutsche Liebe* (*German Love*): Fragments from the Papers of an Alien. Collected by F. Max Müller. Translated from the German by G. A. M. Crown 8vo., gilt top, 5*s.*

Melville (G. J. Whyte).

The Gladiators.	Holmby House.
The Interpreter.	Kate Coventry.
Good for Nothing.	Digby Grand.
The Queen's Maries.	General Bounce.

Crown 8vo., 1*s.* 6*d.* each.

Merriman.—*Flotsam:* A Story of the Indian Mutiny. By Henry Seton Merriman. With Frontispiece and Vignette by H. G. Massey. Cr. 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Morris (William).

The Sundering Flood. Cr. 8vo., 7*s.* 6*d.*

The Water of the Wondrous Isles. Crown 8vo., 7*s.* 6*d.*

The Well at the World's End. 2 vols. 8vo., 28*s.*

The Wood Beyond the World. Crown 8vo., 6*s.* net.

The Story of the Glittering Plain, which has been also called The Land of the Living Men, or The Acre of the Undying. Square post 8vo., 5*s.* net.

The Roots of the Mountains, wherein is told somewhat of the Lives of the Men of Burgdale, their Friends, their Neighbours, their Foemen, and their Fellows-in-Arms. Written in Prose and Verse. Square crown 8vo., 8*s.*

Fiction, Humour, &c.—*continued.*

Morris (William)—*continued.*

A Tale of the House of the Wolfings, and all the Kindreds of the Mark. Written in Prose and Verse. Square crown 8vo., 6*s.*

A Dream of John Ball, and a King's Lesson. 12mo., 1*s.* 6*d.*

News from Nowhere; or, An Epoch of Rest. Being some Chapters from an Utopian Romance. Post 8vo., 1*s.* 6*d.*

The Story of Grettir the Strong. Translated from the Icelandic by Eiríkr Magnússon and William Morris. Cr. 8vo., 5*s.* net.

Three Northern Love Stories, and Other Tales. Translated from the Icelandic by Eiríkr Magnússon and William Morris. Crown 8vo., 6*s.* net.

*** For Mr. William Morris's other Works, see pp. 24, 37 and 40.

Newman (Cardinal).

Loss and Gain: The Story of a Convert. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Callista: A Tale of the Third Century. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Phillipps-Wolley.—*Snap:* a Legend of the Lone Mountain. By C. Phillipps-Wolley. With 13 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Ridley.—*Anne Mainwaring.* By Alice Ridley, Author of 'The Story of Aline'. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

Sewell (Elizabeth M.).

A Glimpse of the World.	Amy Herbert.
Laneton Parsonage.	Cleve Hall.
Margaret Percival.	Gertrude.
Katharine Ashton.	Home Life.
The Earl's Daughter.	After Life.
The Experience of Life.	Ursula. Ivors.

Cr. 8vo., cloth plain, 1*s.* 6*d.* each. Cloth extra, gilt edges, 2*s.* 6*d.* each.

Sheehan.—*Luke Delmege.* By the Rev. P. A. Sheehan, P.P., Author of 'My New Curate'. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

Somerville (E. Œ.) **and Ross** (Martin).

Some Experiences of an Irish R.M. With 31 Illustrations by E. Œ. Somerville. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

The Real Charlotte. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

The Silver Fox. Cr. 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Stebbing.—*Rachel Wulfstan,* and other Stories. By W. Stebbing, author of 'Probable Tales'. Crown 8vo., 4*s.* 6*d.*

Stevenson (Robert Louis).

The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. Fcp. 8vo., 1*s.* sewed. 1*s.* 6*d.* cloth.

The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde; with other Fables. Crown 8vo., bound in buckram, with gilt top, 5*s.* net.

'*Silver Library*' *Edition.* Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

More New Arabian Nights—The Dynamiter. By Robert Louis Stevenson and Fanny van de Grift Stevenson. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

The Wrong Box. By Robert Louis Stevenson and Lloyd Osbourne. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Fiction, Humour, &c.—*continued.*

Suttner.—*Lay Down Your Arms* (*Die Waffen Nieder*); The Autobiography of Martha von Tilling. By Bertha von Suttner. Translated by T. Holmes. Cr. 8vo., 1*s.* 6*d.*

Swan.—*Ballast.* By Myra Swan. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

Trollope (Anthony).

The Warden. Cr. 8vo., 1*s.* 6*d.*

Barchester Towers. Cr. 8vo., 1*s.* 6*d.*

Walford (L. B.).

Charlotte. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

One of Ourselves. Cr. 8vo., 6*s.*

The Intruders. Crown 8vo., 2*s.* 6*d.*

Leddy Margetson. Crown 8vo., 2*s.* 6*d.*

Iva Kildare: a Matrimonial Problem. Crown 8vo., 2*s.* 6*d.*

Mr. Smith: a Part of his Life. Crown 8vo., 2*s.* 6*d.*

The Baby's Grandmother. Cr. 8vo., 2*s.* 6*d.*

Cousins. Crown 8vo., 2*s.* 6*d.*

Troublesome Daughters. Cr. 8vo., 2*s.* 6*d.*

Pauline. Crown 8vo., 2*s.* 6*d.*

Dick Netherby. Cr. 8vo., 2*s.* 6*d.*

The History of a Week. Cr. 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

A Stiff-necked Generation. Cr. 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Nan, and other Stories. Cr. 8vo., 2*s.* 6*d.*

Walford (L. B.)—*continued.*

The Mischief of Monica. Cr. 8vo., 2*s.* 6*d.*

The One Good Guest. Cr. 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

'*Ploughed*,' and other Stories. Crown 8vo., 2*s.* 6*d.*

The Matchmaker. Cr. 8vo., 2*s.* 6*d.*

Ward.—*One Poor Scruple.* By Mrs. Wilfrid Ward. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

Weyman (Stanley).

The House of the Wolf. With Frontispiece and Vignette. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

A Gentleman of France. With Frontispiece and Vignette. Cr. 8vo., 6*s.*

The Red Cockade. With Frontispiece and Vignette. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

Shrewsbury. With 24 Illustrations by Claude A. Shepperson. Cr. 8vo., 6*s.*

Sophia. With Frontispiece. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

Yeats (S. Levett-).

The Chevalier D'Auriac. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

The Traitor's Way. Cr. 8vo., 6*s.*

Yoxall.—*The Romany Stone.* By J. H. Yoxall, M.P. Crown 8vo., 6*s.*

Popular Science (Natural History, &c.).

Butler.—*Our Household Insects.* An Account of the Insect-Pests found in Dwelling-Houses. By Edward A. Butler, B.A., B.Sc. (Lond.). With 113 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Furneaux (W.).

The Outdoor World; or The Young Collector's Handbook. With 18 Plates (16 of which are coloured), and 549 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., gilt edges, 6*s.* net.

Butterflies and Moths (British). With 12 coloured Plates and 241 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., gilt edges, 6*s.* net.

Life in Ponds and Streams. With 8 coloured Plates and 331 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., gilt edges, 6*s.* net.

Hartwig (George).

The Sea and its Living Wonders. With 12 Plates and 303 Woodcuts. 8vo., gilt top, 7*s.* net.

The Tropical World. With 8 Plates and 172 Woodcuts. 8vo., gilt top, 7*s.* net.

The Polar World. With 3 Maps, 8 Plates and 85 Woodcuts. 8vo., gilt top, 7*s.* net.

The Subterranean World. With 3 Maps and 80 Woodcuts. 8vo., gilt top, 7*s.* net.

Helmholtz.—*Popular Lectures on Scientific Subjects.* By Hermann von Helmholtz. With 68 Woodcuts. 2 vols. Cr. 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

Hudson (W. H.).

Birds and Man. Large crown 8vo., 6*s.* net.

Nature in Downland. With 12 Plates and 14 Illustrations in the Text by A. D. McCormick. 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

British Birds. With a Chapter on Structure and Classification by Frank E. Beddard, F.R.S. With 16 Plates (8 of which are Coloured), and over 100 Illustrations in the Text. Crown 8vo., gilt edges, 6*s.* net.

Millais.—*The Natural History of the British Surface Feeding-Ducks.* By John Guille Millais, F.Z.S., etc. With 6 Photogravures and 66 Plates (41 in Colours) from Drawings by the Author, Archibald Thorburn, and from Photographs. Royal 4to., £6 6*s.*

Proctor (Richard A.).

Light Science for Leisure Hours. Familiar Essays on Scientific Subjects. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Rough Ways made Smooth. Familiar Essays on Scientific Subjects. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Pleasant Ways in Science. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Nature Studies. By R. A. Proctor, Grant Allen, A. Wilson, T. Foster and E. Clodd. Cr. 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Leisure Readings. By R. A. Proctor, E. Clodd, A. Wilson, T. Foster and A. C. Ranyard. Cr. 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

*** *For Mr. Proctor's other books see pp.* 17 *and* 35, *and Messrs. Longmans & Co.'s Catalogue of Scientific Works.*

Popular Science (Natural History, &c.)—*continued.*

Stanley.—*A Familiar History of Birds.* By E. Stanley, D.D., formerly Bishop of Norwich. With 160 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Wood (Rev. J. G.).

Homes without Hands: A Description of the Habitations of Animals, classed according to their Principle of Construction. With 140 Illustrations. 8vo., gilt top, 7*s.* net.

Insects at Home: A Popular Account of British Insects, their Structure, Habits and Transformations. With 700 Illustrations. 8vo., gilt top, 7*s.* net.

Wood (Rev. J. G.)—*continued.*

Insects Abroad: A Popular Account of Foreign Insects, their Structure, Habits and Transformations. With 600 Illustrations. 8vo., 7*s.* net.

Out of Doors; a Selection of Original Articles on Practical Natural History. With 11 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Petland Revisited. With 33 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Strange Dwellings: a Description of the Habitations of Animals, abridged from 'Homes without Hands'. With 60 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Works of Reference.

Gwilt.—*An Encyclopædia of Architecture.* By Joseph Gwilt, F.S.A. With 1700 Engravings. Revised (1888), with Alterations and Considerable Additions by Wyatt Papworth. 8vo., 21*s.* net.

Longmans' *Gazetteer of the World.* Edited by George G. Chisholm, M.A., B.Sc. Imperial 8vo., 18*s.* net; cloth, 21*s.* half-morocco.

Maunder (Samuel).

Biographical Treasury. With Supplement brought down to 1889. By Rev. James Wood. Fcp. 8vo., 6*s.*

The Treasury of Bible Knowledge. By the Rev. J. Ayre, M.A. With 5 Maps, 15 Plates, and 300 Woodcuts. Fcp. 8vo., 6*s.*

Treasury of Knowledge and Library of Reference. Fcp. 8vo., 6*s.*

Maunder (Samuel)—*continued.*

The Treasury of Botany. Edited by J. Lindley, F.R.S., and T. Moore, F.L.S. With 274 Woodcuts and 20 Steel Plates. 2 vols. Fcp. 8vo., 12*s.*

Roget. — *Thesaurus of English Words and Phrases.* Classified and Arranged so as to Facilitate the Expression of Ideas and assist in Literary Composition. By Peter Mark Roget, M.D., F.R.S. Recomposed throughout, enlarged and improved, partly from the Author's Notes, and with a full Index, by the Author's Son, John Lewis Roget. Crown 8vo., 9*s.* net.

Willich.—*Popular Tables* for giving information for ascertaining the value of Lifehold, Leasehold, and Church Property, the Public Funds, etc. By Charles M. Willich. Edited by H. Bence Jones. Crown 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.*

Children's Books.

Adelborg.—*Clean Peter and the Children of Grubbylea.* By Ottilia Adelborg. Translated from the Swedish by Mrs. Graham Wallas. With 23 Coloured Plates. Oblong 4to., boards, 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Alick's Adventures.—By G. R. With 8 Illustrations by John Hassall. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Brown.—*The Book of Saints and Friendly Beasts.* By Abbie Farwell Brown. With 8 Illustrations by Fanny Y. Cory. Crown 8vo., 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

Buckland.—*Two Little Runaways.* Adapted from the French of Louis Desnoyers. By James Buckland. With 110 Illustrations by Cecil Aldin. Cr. 8vo., 6*s.*

Crake (Rev. A. D.).

Edwy the Fair; or, The First Chronicle of Æscendune. Cr. 8vo., silver top, 2*s.* net.

Alfgar the Dane; or, The Second Chronicle of Æscendune. Cr. 8vo., silver top, 2*s.* net.

The Rival Heirs: being the Third and Last Chronicle of Æscendune. Cr. 8vo., silver top, 2*s.* net.

The House of Walderne. A Tale of the Cloister and the Forest in the Days of the Barons' Wars. Crown 8vo., silver top, 2*s.* net.

Brian Fitz-Count. A Story of Wallingford Castle and Dorchester Abbey. Cr. 8vo., silver top, 2*s.* net.

Henty (G. A.).—Edited by.

Yule Logs: A Story-Book for Boys. By Various Authors. With 61 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., gilt edges, 3*s.* net.

Yule Tide Yarns: a Story-Book for Boys. By Various Authors. With 45 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., gilt edges, 3*s.* net.

Lang (Andrew).—Edited by.

The Violet Fairy Book. With 8 Coloured Plates and 54 other Illustrations. Crown 8vo., gilt edges, 6*s.*

The Blue Fairy Book. With 138 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., gilt edges, 6*s.*

The Red Fairy Book. With 100 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., gilt edges, 6*s.*

The Green Fairy Book. With 99 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., gilt edges, 6*s.*

The Grey Fairy Book. With 65 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., gilt edges, 6*s.*

The Yellow Fairy Book. With 104 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., gilt edges, 6*s.*

The Pink Fairy Book. With 67 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., gilt edges, 6*s.*

The Blue Poetry Book. With 100 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., gilt edges, 6*s.*

The True Story Book. With 66 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., gilt edges, 6*s.*

The Red True Story Book. With 100 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., gilt edges, 6*s.*

The Animal Story Book. With 67 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., gilt edges, 6*s.*

The Red Book of Animal Stories. With 65 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., gilt edges, 6*s.*

The Arabian Nights Entertainments. With 66 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., gilt edges, 6*s.*

The Book of Romance. With 8 Coloured Plates and 44 other Illustrations. Crown 8vo., gilt edges, 6*s.*

Lyall.—*The Burges Letters:* a Record of Child Life in the Sixties. By Edna Lyall. With Coloured Frontispiece and 8 other Full-page Illustrations by Walter S. Stacey. Crown 8vo., 2*s.* 6*d.*

Meade (L. T.).

Daddy's Boy. With 8 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., gilt edges, 3*s.* net.

Deb and the Duchess. With 7 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., gilt edges, 3*s.* net.

The Beresford Prize. With 7 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., gilt edges, 3*s.* net.

The House of Surprises. With 6 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., gilt edges, 3*s.* net.

Children's Books—*continued.*

Murray. — *Flower Legends for Children.* By Hilda Murray (the Hon. Mrs. Murray of Elibank). Pictured by J. S. Eland. With numerous Coloured and other Illustrations. Oblong 4to., 6*s.*

Penrose. — *Chubby: a Nuisance.* By Mrs. Penrose. With 8 Illustrations by G. G. Manton. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Praeger (Rosamond).

The Adventures of the Three Bold Babes: Hector, Honoria and Alisander. A Story in Pictures. With 24 Coloured Plates and 24 Outline Pictures. Oblong 4to., 3*s.* 6*d.*

The Further Doings of the Three Bold Babes. With 24 Coloured Pictures and 24 Outline Pictures. Oblong 4to., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Roberts. — *The Adventures of Captain John Smith:* Captain of Two Hundred and Fifty Horse, and sometime President of Virginia. By E. P. Roberts. With 17 Illustrations and 3 Maps. Crown 8vo., 5*s.* net.

Stevenson.—*A Child's Garden of Verses.* By Robert Louis Stevenson. Fcp. 8vo., gilt top, 5*s.*

Tappan.—*Old Ballads in Prose.* By Eva March Tappan. With 4 Illustrations by Fanny Y. Cory. Crown 8vo., gilt top, 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

Upton (Florence K. and Bertha).

The Adventures of Two Dutch Dolls and a 'Golliwogg'. With 31 Coloured Plates and numerous Illustrations in the Text. Oblong 4to., 6*s.*

The Golliwogg's Bicycle Club. With 31 Coloured Plates and numerous Illustrations in the Text. Oblong 4to., 6*s.*

The Golliwogg at the Seaside. With 31 Coloured Plates and numerous Illustrations in the Text. Oblong 4to., 6*s.*

The Golliwogg in War. With 31 Coloured Plates. Oblong 4to., 6*s.*

The Golliwogg's Polar Adventures. With 31 Coloured Plates. Oblong 4to., 6*s.*

The Golliwogg's Auto-go-cart. With 31 Coloured Plates and numerous Illustrations in the Text. Oblong 4to., 6*s.*

The Golliwogg's Air-Ship. With 30 Coloured Pictures and numerous Illustrations in the Text. Oblong 4to., 6*s.*

The Vege-Men's Revenge. With 31 Coloured Plates and numerous Illustrations in the Text. Oblong 4to., 6*s.*

Wemyss.—*'Things We Thought of':* Told from a Child's Point of View. By Mary C. E. Wemyss, Author of 'All About All of Us'. With 8 Illustrations in Colour by S. R. Praeger. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

The Silver Library.

Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.* each Volume.

Arnold's (Sir Edwin) Seas and Lands. With 71 Illustrations. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Bagehot's (W.) Biographical Studies. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Bagehot's (W.) Economic Studies. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Bagehot's (W.) Literary Studies. With Portrait. 3 vols., 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

Baker's (Sir S. W.) Eight Years in Ceylon. With 6 Illustrations. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Baker's (Sir S. W.) Rifle and Hound in Ceylon. With 6 Illustrations. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Baring-Gould's (Rev. S.) Curious Myths of the Middle Ages. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Baring-Gould's (Rev. S.) Origin and Development of Religious Belief. 2 vols. 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

Becker's (W. A.) Gallus: or, Roman Scenes in the Time of Augustus. With 26 Illus. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Becker's (W. A.) Charicles: or, Illustrations of the Private Life of the Ancient Greeks. With 26 Illustrations. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Bent's (J. T.) The Ruined Cities of Mashonaland. With 117 Illustrations. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Brassey's (Lady) A Voyage in the 'Sunbeam'. With 66 Illustrations. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Buckle's (H. T.) History of Civilisation in England. 3 vols. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Churchill's (W. Spencer) The Story of the Malakand Field Force, 1897. With 6 Maps and Plans. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Clodd's (E.) Story of Creation: a Plain Account of Evolution. With 77 Illustrations. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Conybeare (Rev. W. J.) and Howson's (Very Rev. J. S.) Life and Epistles of St. Paul. With 46 Illustrations. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Dougall's (L.) Beggars All: a Novel. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Doyle's (Sir A. Conan) Micah Clarke. A Tale of Monmouth's Rebellion. With 10 Illusts. 3*s.* 6*d.*

The Silver Library—*continued.*

Doyle's (Sir A. Conan) The Captain of the Polestar, and other Tales. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Doyle's (Sir A. Conan) The Refugees: A Tale of the Huguenots. With 25 Illustrations. 3*s* 6*d.*

Doyle's (Sir A. Conan) The Stark Munro Letters. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Froude's (J. A.) The History of England, from the Fall of Wolsey to the Defeat of the Spanish Armada. 12 vols. 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

Froude's (J. A.) The English in Ireland. 3 vols. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Froude's (J. A.) The Divorce of Catherine of Aragon. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Froude's (J. A.) The Spanish Story of the Armada, and other Essays. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Froude's (J. A.) English Seamen in the Sixteenth Century. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Froude's (J. A.) Short Studies on Great Subjects. 4 vols. 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

Froude's (J. A.) Oceana, or England and Her Colonies. With 9 Illustrations. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Froude's (J. A.) The Council of Trent. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Froude's (J. A.) The Life and Letters of Erasmus. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Froude's (J. A.) Thomas Carlyle: a History of his Life.
1795-1835. 2 vols. 7*s.* 1834-1881. 2 vols. 7*s.*

Froude's (J. A.) Cæsar: a Sketch. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Froude's (J. A.) The Two Chiefs of Dunboy: an Irish Romance of the Last Century. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Froude's (J. A.) Writings, Selections from. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Gleig's (Rev. G. R.) Life of the Duke of Wellington. With Portrait. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Greville's (C. C. F.) Journal of the Reigns of King George IV., King William IV., and Queen Victoria. 8 vols., 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

Haggard's (H. R.) She: A History of Adventure. With 32 Illustrations. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Haggard's (H. R.) Allan Quatermain. With 20 Illustrations. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Haggard's (H. R.) Colonel Quaritch, V.C.: a Tale of Country Life. With Frontispiece and Vignette. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Haggard's (H. R.) Cleopatra. With 29 Illustrations. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Haggard's (H. R.) Eric Brighteyes. With 51 Illustrations. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Haggard's (H. R.) Beatrice. With Frontispiece and Vignette. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Haggard's (H. R.) Allan's Wife. With 34 Illustrations. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Haggard (H. R.) Heart of the World. With 15 Illustrations. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Haggard's (H. R.) Montezuma's Daughter. With 25 Illustrations. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Haggard's (H. R.) Swallow: a Tale of the Great Trek. With 8 Illustrations. 3*s.* 6d.

Haggard's (H. R.) The Witch's Head. With 16 Illustrations. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Haggard's (H. R.) Mr. Meeson's Will. With 16 Illustrations. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Haggard's (H. R.) Nada the Lily. With 23 Illustrations. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Haggard's (H. R.) Dawn. With 16 Illusts. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Haggard's (H. R.) The People of the Mist. With 16 Illustrations. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Haggard's (H. R.) Joan Haste. With 20 Illustrations. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Haggard (H. R.) and Lang's (A.) The World's Desire. With 27 Illustrations. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Harte's (Bret) In the Carquinez Woods and other Stories. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Helmholtz's (Hermann von) Popular Lectures on Scientific Subjects. With 68 Illustrations. 2 vols. 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

Hope's (Anthony) The Heart of Princess Osra. With 9 Illustrations. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Howitt's (W.) Visits to Remarkable Places. With 80 Illustrations. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Jefferies' (R.) The Story of My Heart: My Autobiography. With Portrait. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Jefferies' (R.) Field and Hedgerow. With Portrait. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Jefferies' (R.) Red Deer. With 17 Illusts. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Jefferies' (R.) Wood Magic: a Fable. With Frontispiece and Vignette by E. V. B. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Jefferies (R.) The Toilers of the Field. With Portrait from the Bust in Salisbury Cathedral. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Kaye (Sir J.) and Malleson's (Colonel) History of the Indian Mutiny of 1857-8. 6 vols. 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

Knight's (E. F.) The Cruise of the 'Alerte': the Narrative of a Search for Treasure on the Desert Island of Trinidad. With 2 Maps and 23 Illustrations. 3*s.* 6*d.*

The Silver Library—*continued.*

Knight's (E. F.) Where Three Empires Meet: a Narrative of Recent Travel in Kashmir, Western Tibet, Baltistan, Gilgit. With a Map and 54 Illustrations. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Knight's (E. F.) The 'Falcon' on the Baltic: a Coasting Voyage from Hammersmith to Copenhagen in a Three-Ton Yacht. With Map and 11 Illustrations. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Köstlin's (J.) Life of Luther. With 62 Illustrations and 4 Facsimiles of MSS. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Lang's (A.) Angling Sketches. With 20 Illustrations. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Lang's (A.) Custom and Myth: Studies of Early Usage and Belief. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Lang's (A.) Cock Lane and Common-Sense. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Lang's (A.) The Book of Dreams and Ghosts. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Lang's (A.) A Monk of Fife: a Story of the Days of Joan of Arc. With 13 Illustrations. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Lang's (A.) Myth, Ritual, and Religion. 2 vols. 7*s.*

Lees (J. A.) and Clutterbuck's (W. J.) B.C. 1887, A Ramble in British Columbia. With Maps and 75 Illustrations. 3*s.* 6*d*

Levett-Yeats' (S.) The Chevalier D'Auriac. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Macaulay's (Lord) Complete Works. 'Albany' Edition. With 12 Portraits. 12 vols. 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

Macaulay's (Lord) Essays and Lays of Ancient Rome, etc. With Portrait and 4 Illustrations to the 'Lays'. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Macleod's (H. D.) Elements of Banking. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Marshman's (J. C.) Memoirs of Sir Henry Havelock. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Mason (A. E. W.) and Lang's (A.) Parson Kelly. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Merivale's (Dean) History of the Romans under the Empire. 8 vols. 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

Merriman's (H. S.) Flotsam: A Tale of the Indian Mutiny. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Mill's (J. S.) Political Economy. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Mill's (J. S.) System of Logic. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Milner's (Geo.) Country Pleasures: the Chronicle of a Year chiefly in a Garden. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Nansen's (F.) The First Crossing of Greenland. With 142 Illustrations and a Map. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Phillipps-Wolley's (C.) Snap: a Legend of the Lone Mountain With 13 Illustrations. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Proctor's (R. A.) The Orbs Around Us. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Proctor's (R. A.) The Expanse of Heaven. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Proctor's (R. A.) Light Science for Leisure Hours. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Proctor's (R. A.) The Moon. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Proctor's (R. A.) Other Worlds than Ours. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Proctor's (R. A.) Our Place among Infinities: a Series of Essays contrasting our Little Abode in Space and Time with the Infinities around us. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Proctor's (R. A.) Other Suns than Ours. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Proctor's (R. A.) Rough Ways made Smooth. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Proctor's (R. A.) Pleasant Ways in Science. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Proctor's (R. A.) Myths and Marvels of Astronomy. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Proctor's (R. A.) Nature Studies. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Proctor's (R. A.) Leisure Readings. By R. A. Proctor, Edward Clodd, Andrew Wilson, Thomas Foster, and A. C. Ranyard. With Illustrations. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Rossetti's (Maria F.) A Shadow of Dante. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Smith's (R. Bosworth) Carthage and the Carthaginians. With Maps, Plans, etc. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Stanley's (Bishop) Familiar History of Birds. With 160 Illustrations. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Stephen's (Sir Leslie) The Playground of Europe (The Alps). With 4 Illustrations. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Stevenson's (R. L.) The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde; with other Fables. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Stevenson (R. L.) and Osbourne's (Ll.) The Wrong Box. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Stevenson (Robert Louis) and Stevenson's (Fanny van de Grift) More New Arabian Nights.—The Dynamiter. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Trevelyan's (Sir G. O.) The Early History of Charles James Fox. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Weyman's (Stanley J.) The House of the Wolf: a Romance. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Wood's (Rev. J. G.) Petland Revisited. With 33 Illustrations 3*s.* 6*d.*

Wood's (Rev. J. G.) Strange Dwellings. With 60 Illustrations. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Wood's (Rev. J. G.) Out of Doors. With 11 Illustrations. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Cookery, Domestic Management, &c.

Acton. — *Modern Cookery.* By Eliza Acton. With 150 Woodcuts. Fcp. 8vo., 4*s.* 6*d.*

Angwin.—*Simple Hints on Choice of Food*, with Tested and Economical Recipes. For Schools, Homes, and Classes for Technical Instruction. By M. C. Angwin, Diplomate (First Class) of the National Union for the Technical Training of Women, etc. Crown 8vo., 1*s.*

Ashby.—*Health in the Nursery.* By Henry Ashby, M.D., F.R.C.P., Physician to the Manchester Children's Hospital. With 25 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* net.

Bull (Thomas, M.D.).

Hints to Mothers on the Management of their Health during the Period of Pregnancy. Fcp. 8vo., sewed, 1*s.* 6*d.*; cloth, gilt edges, 2*s.* net.

The Maternal Management of Children in Health and Disease. Fcp. 8vo., sewed, 1*s.* 6*d.*; cloth, gilt edges, 2*s.* net.

De Salis (Mrs.).

À la Mode Cookery: Up-to-date Recipes. With 24 Plates (16 in Colour). Crown 8vo., 5*s.* net.

Cakes and Confections à la Mode. Fcp. 8vo., 1*s.* 6*d.*

Dogs: A Manual for Amateurs. Fcp. 8vo., 1*s.* 6*d.*

Dressed Game and Poultry à la Mode. Fcp. 8vo., 1*s.* 6*d.*

Dressed Vegetables à la Mode. Fcp. 8vo., 1*s* 6*d.*

Drinks à la Mode. Fcp. 8vo., 1*s.* 6*d.*

De Salis (Mrs.)—*continued.*

Entrées à la Mode. Fcp. 8vo., 1*s.* 6*d.*

Floral Decorations. Fcp. 8vo., 1*s.* 6*d.*

Gardening à la Mode. Fcp. 8vo. Part I., Vegetables, 1*s.* 6*d.* Part II., Fruits, 1*s.* 6*d.*

National Viands à la Mode. Fcp. 8vo., 1*s.* 6*d.*

New-laid Eggs. Fcp. 8vo., 1*s.* 6*d.*

Oysters à la Mode. Fcp. 8vo., 1*s.* 6*d.*

Puddings and Pastry à la Mode. Fcp. 8vo., 1*s.* 6*d.*

Savouries à la Mode. Fcp. 8vo., 1*s.* 6*d.*

Soups and Dressed Fish à la Mode. Fcp. 8vo., 1*s.* 6*d.*

Sweets and Supper Dishes à la Mode. Fcp. 8vo., 1*s.* 6*d.*

Tempting Dishes for Small Incomes. Fcp. 8vo., 1*s.* 6*d.*

Wrinkles and Notions for Every Household. Crown 8vo., 1*s.* 6*d.*

Lear.—*Maigre Cookery.* By H. L. Sidney Lear. 16mo., 2*s.*

Poole.—*Cookery for the Diabetic.* By W. H. and Mrs. Poole. With Preface by Dr. Pavy. Fcp. 8vo., 2*s.* 6*d.*

Rotheram. — *Household Cookery Recipes.* By M. A. Rotheram, First Class Diplomée, National Training School of Cookery, London; Instructress to the Bedfordshire County Council. Crown 8vo., 2*s.*

The Fine Arts and Music.

Burne-Jones.—*The Beginning of the World:* Twenty-five Pictures by Edward Burne-Jones. Medium 4to., Boards, 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Burns and Colenso.—*Living Anatomy.* By Cecil L. Burns, R.B.A., and Robert J. Colenso, M.A., M.D. 40 Plates, 11¼ by 8¾ ins., each Plate containing Two Figures—(*a*) A Natural Male or Female Figure; (*b*) The same Figure Anatomatised. In a Portfolio, 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Hamlin.—*A Text-Book of the History of Architecture.* By A. D. F. Hamlin, A.M. With 229 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 7*s.* 6*d.*

Haweis (Rev. H. R.).

Music and Morals. With Portrait of the Author, and numerous Illustrations, Facsimiles, and Diagrams. Cr. 8vo., 6*s.* net.

My Musical Life. With Portrait of Richard Wagner and 3 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6*s.* net.

The Fine Arts and Music—*continued.*

Huish, Head, and Longman.—*Samplers and Tapestry Embroideries.* By Marcus B. Huish, LL.B.; also 'The Stitchery of the Same,' by Mrs. Head; and 'Foreign Samplers,' by Mrs. C. J. Longman. With 30 Reproductions in Colour, and 40 Illustrations in Monochrome. 4to., £2 2s. net.

Hullah.—*The History of Modern Music.* By John Hullah. 8vo., 8s. 6d.

Jameson (Mrs. Anna).

Sacred and Legendary Art, containing Legends of the Angels and Archangels, the Evangelists, the Apostles, the Doctors of the Church, St. Mary Magdalene, the Patron Saints, the Martyrs, the Early Bishops, the Hermits, and the Warrior-Saints of Christendom, as represented in the Fine Arts. With 19 Etchings and 187 Woodcuts. 2 vols. 8vo., 20s. net.

Legends of the Monastic Orders, as represented in the Fine Arts, comprising the Benedictines and Augustines, and Orders derived from their Rules, the Mendicant Orders, the Jesuits, and the Order of the Visitation of St. Mary. With 11 Etchings and 88 Woodcuts. 1 vol. 8vo., 10s. net.

Legends of the Madonna, or Blessed Virgin Mary. Devotional with and without the Infant Jesus, Historical from the Annunciation to the Assumption, as represented in Sacred and Legendary Christian Art. With 27 Etchings and 165 Woodcuts. 1 vol. 8vo., 10s. net.

The History of Our Lord, as exemplified in Works of Art, with that of His Types, St. John the Baptist, and other persons of the Old and New Testament. Commenced by the late Mrs. Jameson; continued and completed by Lady Eastlake. With 31 Etchings and 281 Woodcuts. 2 vols. 8vo., 20s. net.

Kristeller.—*Andrea Mantegna.* By Paul Kristeller. English Edition by S. Arthur Strong, M.A., Librarian to the House of Lords, and at Chatsworth. With 26 Photogravure Plates and 162 Illustrations in the Text. 4to., gilt top, £3 10s. net.

Macfarren.—*Lectures on Harmony.* By Sir George A. Macfarren. 8vo., 12s.

Morris (William).

Architecture, Industry and Wealth. Collected Papers. Crown 8vo., 6s. net.

Hopes and Fears for Art. Five Lectures delivered in Birmingham, London, etc., in 1878-1881. Cr 8vo., 4s. 6d.

An Address delivered at the Distribution of Prizes to Students of the Birmingham Municipal School of Art on 21st February, 1894. 8vo., 2s. 6d. net. (*Printed in 'Golden' Type.*)

Some Hints on Pattern-Designing: a Lecture delivered at the Working Men's College, London, on 10th December, 1881. 8vo., 2s. 6d. net. (*Printed in 'Golden' Type.*)

Arts and its Producers (1888) *and the Arts and Crafts of To-day* (1889). 8vo., 2s. 6d. net. (*Printed in 'Golden' Type.*)

Architecture and History, and Westminster Abbey. Two Papers read before the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings. 8vo., 2s. 6d. net. (*Printed in 'Golden' Type.*)

Arts and Crafts Essays. By Members of the Arts and Crafts Exhibition Society. With a Preface by William Morris. Crown 8vo., 2s. 6d. net.

*** For Mr. William Morris's other Works, see pp. 24, 27, 28 and 40.

Robertson.—*Old English Songs and Dances.* Decorated in Colour by W. Graham Robertson. Royal 4to., 42s. net.

Scott.—*The Portraitures of Julius Cæsar:* a Monograph. By Frank J. Scott. With many Full-page Plates and Illustrations in the Text. Small 4to.

Vanderpoel.—*Colour Problems:* a Practical Manual for the Lay Student of Colour. By Emily Noyes Vanderpoel. With 117 Plates in Colour. Square 8vo., 21s. net.

Van Dyke.—*A Text-Book on the History of Painting.* By John C. Van Dyke. With 110 Illustrations. Cr. 8vo., 6s.

Wellington.—*A Descriptive and Historical Catalogue of the Collections of Pictures and Sculpture at Apsley House, London.* By Evelyn, Duchess of Wellington. Illustrated by 52 Photo-Engravings, specially executed by Braun, Clément, & Co., of Paris. 2 vols., royal 4to., £6 6s. net.

Miscellaneous and Critical Works.

Annals of Mathematics (under the Auspices of Harvard University). Issued Quarterly. 4to., 2*s.* net each number.

Auto da Fé and other Essays: some being Essays in Fiction. By the Author of 'Essays in Paradox' and 'Exploded Ideas'. Crown 8vo., 5*s.*

Bagehot.—*Literary Studies.* By Walter Bagehot. With Portrait. 3 vols. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

Baker. — *Education and Life:* Papers and Addresses. By James H. Baker, M.A., LL.D. Crown 8vo., 4*s.* 6*d.*

Baring-Gould.—*Curious Myths of the Middle Ages.* By Rev. S. Baring-Gould. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Baynes. — *Shakespeare Studies,* and other Essays. By the late Thomas Spencer Baynes, LL.B., LL.D. With a Biographical Preface by Professor Lewis Campbell. Crown 8vo., 7*s.* 6*d.*

Bonnell. — *Charlotte Brontë, George Eliot, Jane Austen:* Studies in their Works. By Henry H. Bonnell. Crown 8vo.

Booth.—*The Discovery and Decipherment of the Trilingual Cuneiform Inscriptions.* By Arthur John Booth, M.A. With a Plan of Persepolis. 8vo. 14*s.* net.

Charities Register, The Annual, *and Digest:* being a Classified Register of Charities in or available in the Metropolis. 8vo., 4*s.*

Christie.—*Selected Essays.* By Richard Copley Christie, M.A., Oxon. Hon. LL.D., Vict. With 2 Portraits and 3 other Illustrations. 8vo., 12*s.* net.

Dickinson.—*King Arthur in Cornwall.* By W. Howship Dickinson, M.D. With 5 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 4*s.* 6*d.*

Essays in Paradox. By the Author of 'Exploded Ideas' and 'Times and Days'. Crown 8vo., 5*s.*

Evans.—*The Ancient Stone Implements, Weapons and Ornaments of Great Britain.* By Sir John Evans, K.C.B. With 537 Illustrations. 8vo., 28*s.*

Exploded Ideas, *and Other Essays.* By the Author of 'Times and Days'. Cr. 8vo., 5*s.*

Frost. — *A Medley Book.* By George Frost. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Geikie.—*The Vicar and his Friends.* Reported by Cunningham Geikie, D.D., LL.D. Crown 8vo., 5*s.* net.

Haggard (H. Rider).

A Farmer's Year: being his Commonplace Book for 1898. With 36 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Rural England. With 23 Agricultural Maps and 56 Illustrations from Photographs. 2 vols., 8vo.

Hoenig. — *Inquiries concerning the Tactics of the Future.* By Fritz Hoenig. With 1 Sketch in the Text and 5 Maps. Translated by Captain H. M. Bower. 8vo., 15*s.* net.

Hutchinson.—*Dreams and their Meanings.* By Horace G. Hutchinson. 8vo., gilt top, 9*s.* 6*d.* net.

Jefferies (Richard).

Field and Hedgerow: With Portrait. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

The Story of My Heart: my Autobiography. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Red Deer. With 17 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

The Toilers of the Field. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Wood Magic: a Fable. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Jekyll (Gertrude).

Home and Garden: Notes and Thoughts, Practical and Critical, of a Worker in both. With 53 Illustrations from Photographs. 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Wood and Garden: Notes and Thoughts, Practical and Critical, of a Working Amateur. With 71 Photographs. 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Miscellaneous and Critical Works—*continued.*

Johnson (J. & J. H.).

The Patentee's Manual: a Treatise on the Law and Practice of Letters Patent. 8vo., 10*s.* 6*d.*

An Epitome of the Law and Practice connected with Patents for Inventions, with a reprint of the Patents Acts of 1883, 1885, 1886 and 1888. Crown 8vo., 2*s.* 6*d.*

Joyce.—*The Origin and History of Irish Names of Places.* By P. W. Joyce, LL.D. 2 vols. Crown 8vo., 5*s.* each.

Lang (Andrew).

Letters to Dead Authors. Fcp. 8vo., 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Books and Bookmen. With 2 Coloured Plates and 17 Illustrations. Fcp. 8vo., 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Old Friends. Fcp. 8vo., 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Letters on Literature. Fcp. 8vo., 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

Essays in Little. With Portrait of the Author. Crown 8vo., 2*s.* 6*d.*

Cock Lane and Common-Sense. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

The Book of Dreams and Ghosts. Crown 8vo., 3*s.* 6*d.*

Maryon.—*How the Garden Grew.* By Maud Maryon. With 4 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 5*s.* net.

Matthews.—*Notes on Speech-Making.* By Brander Matthews. Fcp. 8vo., 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

Max Müller (The Right Hon. F.).

Collected Works. 18 vols. Crown 8vo., 5*s.* each.

Vol. I. *Natural Religion:* the Gifford Lectures, 1888.

Vol. II. *Physical Religion:* the Gifford Lectures, 1890.

Vol. III. *Anthropological Religion:* the Gifford Lectures, 1891.

Vol. IV. *Theosophy;* or, Psychological Religion: the Gifford Lectures, 1892.

Chips from a German Workshop.

Vol. V. Recent Essays and Addresses.

Vol. VI. Biographical Essays.

Vol. VII. Essays on Language and Literature.

Vol. VIII. Essays on Mythology and Folk-lore.

Vol. IX. *The Origin and Growth of Religion,* as Illustrated by the Religions of India: the Hibbert Lectures, 1878.

Vol. X. *Biographies of Words, and the Home of the Aryas.*

Vols. XI., XII. *The Science of Language:* Founded on Lectures delivered at the Royal Institution in 1861 and 1863. 2 vols. 10*s.*

Vol. XIII. *India:* What can it Teach Us?

Vol. XIV. *Introduction to the Science of Religion.* Four Lectures, 1870.

Vol. XV. *Râmakrishna:* his Life and Sayings.

Vol. XVI. *Three Lectures on the Vedânta Philosophy,* 1894.

Vol. XVII. *Last Essays.* First Series. Essays on Language, Folk-lore, etc.

Vol. XVIII. *Last Essays.* Second Series. Essays on the Science of Religion.

Miscellaneous and Critical Works—*continued.*

Milner.—*Country Pleasures:* the Chronicle of a Year chiefly in a Garden. By George Milner. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Morris.—*Signs of Change.* Seven Lectures delivered on various Occasions. By William Morris. Post 8vo., 4s. 6d.

Parker and Unwin.—*The Art of Building a Home:* a Collection of Lectures and Illustrations. By Barry Parker and Raymond Unwin. With 68 Full-page Plates. 8vo., 10s. 6d. net.

Pollock.—*Jane Austen:* her Contemporaries and Herself. By Walter Herries Pollock. Cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d. net.

Poore (George Vivian, M.D.).

Essays on Rural Hygiene. With 13 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 6s. 6d.

The Dwelling House. With 36 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

The Earth in Relation to the Preservation and Destruction of Contagia: being the Milroy Lectures delivered at the Royal College of Physicians in 1899, together with other Papers on Sanitation. With 13 Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 5s.

Rossetti.—*A Shadow of Dante:* being an Essay towards studying Himself, his World and his Pilgrimage. By Maria Francesca Rossetti. Crown 8vo., 3s. 6d.

Shadwell.—*Drink: Temperance and Legislation.* By Arthur Shadwell, M.A., M.D. Crown 8vo., 5s. net.

Soulsby (Lucy H. M.).

Stray Thoughts on Reading. Fcp. 8vo., 2s. 6d. net.

Stray Thoughts for Girls. 16mo., 1s. 6d net.

Stray Thoughts for Mothers and Teachers. Fcp. 8vo., 2s. 6d. net.

Soulsby (Lucy H. M.)—*continued.*

Stray Thoughts for Invalids. 16mo., 2s. net.

Stray Thoughts on Character. Fcp. 8vo., 2s. 6d. net.

Southey.—*The Correspondence of Robert Southey with Caroline Bowles.* Edited by Edward Dowden. 8vo., 14s.

Stevens.—*On the Stowage of Ships and their Cargoes.* With Information regarding Freights, Charter-Parties, etc. By Robert White Stevens. 8vo., 21s.

Sutherland.—*Twentieth Century Inventions:* a Forecast. By George Sutherland, M.A. Crown 8vo., 4s. 6d. net.

Thuillier.—*The Principles of Land Defence, and their Application to the Conditions of To-day.* By Captain H. F. Thuillier, R.E. With Maps and Plans. 8vo., 12s. 6d. net.

Turner and Sutherland.—*The Development of Australian Literature.* By Henry Gyles Turner and Alexander Sutherland. With Portraits and Illustrations. Crown 8vo., 5s.

Warwick.—*Progress in Women's Education in the British Empire:* being the Report of Conferences and a Congress held in connection with the Educational Section, Victorian Era Exhibition. Edited by the Countess of Warwick. Cr. 8vo. 6s.

Weathers.—*A Practical Guide to Garden Plants.* By John Weathers, F.R.H.S. With 159 Diagrams. 8vo., 21s. net.

Webb.—*The Mystery of William Shakespeare:* a Summary of Evidence. By his Honour Judge T. Webb, sometime Regius Professor of Laws and Public Orator in the University of Dublin. 8vo., 10s. 6d. net.

Whittall.—*Frederick the Great on Kingcraft,* from the Original Manuscript; with Reminiscences and Turkish Stories. By Sir J. William Whittall, President of the British Chamber of Commerce of Turkey. 8vo., 7s. 6d. net.

10,000/11/02.

W 28 H